THE MARONITES IN HISTORY

THE MARONITES IN HISTORY

Matti Moosa

GORGIAS PRESS
2005

First Gorgias Press Edition, 2005.

The special contents of this edition are copyright © 2005 by Gorgias Press LLC.

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. Published in the United States of America by Gorgias Press LLC, New Jersey. This edition is a facsimile reprint of the original edition published by Syracuse University Press, New York, 1986.

ISBN 1-59333-182-7

GORGIAS PRESS
46 Orris Ave., Piscataway, NJ 08854 USA
www.gorgiaspress.com

Printed and bound in the United States of America.

To the memory of my beloved Father

ISHAQ MOOSA
(d. 1960)

A token of filial love

MATTI MOOSA is Professor of History at Gannon University, author of *The Origins of Modern Arabic Fiction*, and editor of *The Wives of the Prophets*.

Contents

	Preface	1
	Introduction	5
1	Origin of the Term Maronite	11
2	The Identity of the Ascetic Marun	16
3	The Monastery of Marun	23
4	Earliest Sources on the Monastery of Marun	32
5	Maronite Claims and Sixth-Century Epistolary Documents	39
6	The Council of Constantinople of A.D. 536 and the Letter of the Monks of Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda	54
7	The Maronites and Saint Simon the Stylite	64
8	Peter the Fuller and the Trisagion Dispute	69
9	Signatories to the Letter of the Monks to Pope Hormisda and Related Documents from the Council	74
10	The Maronites and the Letters of the Monks from Syria Secunda	81
11	Were the Monks of the Monastery of Marun Chalcedonians?	87
12	Heraclius and the Monothelitic Formula of Faith	95

13	The Malkites, the Maronites, and the Sixth Council	103
14	Establishment of the Maronites as a Separate Church	110
15	Who is John Marun?	118
16	John Marun: Was He a Patriarch of Antioch?	130
17	John Marun's Writings	148
18	Was John Marun a Canonized Saint?	167
19	The Relation of the Maronites to the Mardaites and the Jarajima	174
20	The Maronites and Monothelitism	195
21	The Relation of the Maronites to the Church of Rome	217
22	The Mission of Fra Gryphon and Other Franciscans to the Maronites	233
23	The Mission of Giovanni Battista Eliano to the Maronites	245
24	The Mission of Jerome Dandini to the Maronites	256
25	The Latinization of the Maronite Church	267
26	The Maronites in Modern Times	279
	Notes	305
	Bibliography	363
	Index	381

Preface

WHO are the Maronites and what is their importance to the existence of the Lebanese Republic? The present crisis in Lebanon has raised questions about the Maronites and the role they play in the Lebanese community. The Maronites are Christians who by confession are Uniates or followers of the Roman Catholic Church. But what is the origin of the Maronite Church and community? What is the cultural heritage of this community, and how does it relate to other groups in the Middle East?

This book attempts to place the history of the Maronites in historical perspective. Maronites today suffer from a serious identity problem. They have not been able to decide whether they are descendants of an ancient people called the Marada (Mardaites) or Arabs or of Syriac-Aramaic stock. Unless the Maronites solve this identity problem their conflicts with other minority religious groups in Lebanon will never be remedied. In essence, this book is a study and analysis of the origin of the Maronites, indeed of their whole historical heritage, an examination based on ancient and modern sources written in many languages, many of which are still in manuscript form.

By faith, liturgy, rite, religious books, and heritage, the Maronites were of Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) origin until the very end of the sixteenth century when they became ultramontane followers of the Roman Catholic Church. At this time, specifically under the Amir Fakhr al-Din

II al-Maʿni, Maronite patriarchs began to play a distinctive role in the internal affairs of Lebanon. In the latter part of the eighteenth century the Maronite Church and community gained increased influence when some of the ruling Shihabi Amirs were converted to Christianity and joined the Maronite Church. From the middle of the nineteenth century until the time of the late Patriarch Bulus Maʿushi (d. 1975), the temporal power of the Maronite patriarchs was manifested in the political affairs of Lebanon. Maronite patriarchs voiced their opinions on almost every issue. They came to be considered not only as the patriarchs and heads of their community but the "Patriarchs of Lebanon." Thus, to the Maronites, Lebanon and Maronitism became synonymous. Furthermore, the Maronites began to consider themselves as a unique community which by religion and culture was distinct from a predominantly Muslim Arab world. It is this concept of the exclusiveness of the Maronite Community which is the primary motive for the Maronites' quest for a distinct identity.

I believe that this history of the Maronite Church and community should be of great interest to church historians, theologians, and general readers who are concerned about the affairs of the Maronites and their relation to the present crisis in Lebanon. This volume provides background information on this crisis and serves as a guide for those interested in learning about the history of this unique Christian community in the Middle East.

I hope that this history of the Maronite Church will fill a gap in the history of the Eastern churches, a history little known in the Western world, and an area of historical research which cries for further cultivation.

I am grateful to Mary Ann Rosenfeld for editing this work. I am indebted to my colleagues Dr. Paul Peterson, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Rev. Dr. Gerard Steckler, and Dr. Michael DiMaio for translating several Latin and Greek passages.

Also, I am indebted to my colleagues, Professor Richard Dekmejian of State University of New York at Binghamton, Dr. Frank Angotti, and Dr. Thomas Szendrey of Gannon University for reading the original manuscript and offering opinions on the subject. I am thankful to my friend and colleague Dr. Hilmi Yusuf for his time and effort in locating several sources at the Library of Congress. I am also thankful to my sister Najiba Moosa of Baghdad, Iraq, who acquired several sources on the Maronites in Lebanon. I am grateful to Miss Rita Ann Nies, Refer-

ence Librarian, and Mrs. Grace Davies, Acquisition Librarian at Gannon University for obtaining sources and microfilms through interlibrary loan, especially manuscripts at the Library of Congress, Vatican Library, and the Graduate Theological Union Library at Berkeley, California. I recognize the assistance of Dr. George Atiyeh, and Fawzi Tadros of the Middle East Section in the Library of Congress, for providing me with sources on the Maronites. I appreciate the assistance of Kay Wojciak, Bonnie Gaarden, and Sally Moldenhauer for proofreading the original manuscript.

Last but not least, the writing of this book could never have been accomplished without the encouragement, understanding, and loving care of my wife.

Spring 1986 MATTI MOOSA

Introduction

ON EXAMINING the history of such Eastern Christian communities as the Nestorian, Chaldean, the Syrian Orthodox of Antioch, Syrian Catholic, Coptic, Armenian Orthodox, Rum Orthodox, and the Uniate Roman Catholic communities, the historian finds at his command a great number of primary and secondary sources in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopian, and Arabic. These sources deal with the different aspects of the history of these communities and their churches: dogma, unity and disunity, patriarchy, ritual, and liturgy. This is not so in the case of the Maronite community. Instead, there is a dearth of religious and historical literature except for the passing remarks made by non-Maronite historians who associate the Maronites with Monothelitism (the belief that in the Incarnation the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, were united in one will and one energy) or their contact with the Crusaders. Both lay and ecclesiastical historians find to their bewilderment that prior to the seventeenth century, the Maronites had no written ecclesiastical history and no church historian of the like of Theodoret of Cyrus, Evagrius, Theophanes, Dionysius Tal Mahri, Michael the Great (the Syrian), or Bar Hebraeus. The one exception is a world history in Arabic by an early tenth-century writer known as Qays. This work began with the creation and ended with the reign of the Abbasid Caliph al-Muktafi (d. 908). The only writer to mention this history is the tenth-century historian Abu al-Hasan al-Mas'udi in his

Kitab al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf (Book of Admonition and Supervision) (Cairo, 1938), p. 132. It is unfortunate that Qays's history is no longer extant. Not until the seventeenth century do we find for the first time an ecclesiastical and temporal history of the Maronites and their church. It is entitled *Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya (History of the Maronite Denomination)* and was written by the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704). Originally written in Garshuni (Arabic in Syriac letters), this history was edited by Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni and published in Beirut in 1890.

There are some Maronite sources written prior to the seventeenth century, but they do not specifically deal with the history of the Maronite community. Two of these date back to the eleventh century: *Kitab al-Huda* (Nomocanon), and the *Ten Treatises* by Tuma, Maronite bishop of Kfartab in north Syria. In essence, *al-Huda* deals with the rules of the Maronite Church, while the second source contains an apology for Monothelitism as a Maronite doctrine.

In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries we find a Maronite apologetic, Jabra'il Ibn al-Qila'i (d. 1516), bishop of Nicosia, Cyprus, defending the "orthodoxy" of the Maronite Church against the charges of Monothelitism. What al-Qila'i meant by "orthodoxy" is the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon (451) which became the faith of the Church of Rome. This faith emphasized that in the Incarnation the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, were united in one person yet remained distinct after the union. This definition of the faith was rejected by the majority of church leaders in Syria and Egypt, who maintained that the logical outcome of the union of the two natures of Christ was not two distinct natures but One Incarnate Nature of the God Logos (the Word). Al-Qila'i's intention was to prove that the Maronite Church had always adhered to the faith of Chalcedon and that it had never deviated therefrom. In other words, al-Qila'i was the first Maronite in modern times to claim that the Maronite Church and the Church of Rome were of the same faith and that both were defenders of the Chalcedonian "orthodoxy." Al-Qila'i was also the first to write that Yuhanna (John) Marun, believed to have died in 707, was the first Maronite "Patriarch of Great Antioch"; he did so in his work entitled *Marun al-Tubani (Blessed Marun),* still in manuscript form (Vatican Garshuni MS. 640). Al-Qila'i provides information about the background of this John Marun, claiming him to be the son of Agathon and of Frankish origin. Later in the seventeenth century al-Duwayhi expands this story and goes a step further by making John Marun a nephew of Emperor Charlemagne. Al-Qila'i also wrote an ode in colloquial Lebanese Arabic enti-

tled *Madihat Kisrawan*. This ode is commonly referred to as the *Zajaliyya* because it is written in the Zajal meter, and some Maronites consider it a historical record of the Maronite Church from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries. While the *Zajaliyya* contains references to the Maronites and their church in the fifteenth century, it cannot be regarded as a record of the history of this church.

In 1584 a Maronite school was founded in Rome to educate Maronite young men in the Roman Catholic faith. Some graduates of this school began the practice of writing in Latin about the origin of the Maronites, their names, and their church. Notable among these were Jabra'il al-Sihyuni (Gabriel Sionita, d. 1648), Ibrahim al-Haqillani (Abraham Ecchellensis, d. 1664), and Murhij Ibn Nirun al-Bani (Faustus Nairon, d. 1711), who more than any other Maronite endeavored to explain the name and origin of the Maronites. He wrote two books: *Dissertatio de origine nomine et religione Maronitarum* (Rome, 1679), and *Evoplia fidei catholicae romanae historico-dogmatica* (Rome, 1694). But no Maronite has written so thoroughly and systematically about the history of the Maronite Church and community as Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi, considered the first Maronite historian in modern times.

While al-Qila'i defended the orthodoxy (meaning adherence to the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon) of the Maronite Church, Faustus Nairon was the first to assert that the term "Maronite" derived from the name of a fifth-century ascetic named Marun. To be sure, fifth-century historian Theodoret of Cyrus in his *Religiosa Historia,* which treats the life story of ascetics in his time, provided a short biography of an ascetic named Marun, although he had not met him. Beginning with Nairon, Maronite writers found in the name of this Marun a solution to their identity problem. Other Maronites maintain that the term "Maronite" derived from a monastery in Syria Secunda (that part of Syria which at the end of the fourth century A.D. included the towns of Apamea, Epiphania, Arethusa, and Larissa), the Monastery of Marun, but they fail to substantiate that this monastery is the one they claim to be the source of their church and community. However, Maronites like al-Duwayhi, insist that their church and community have their origin in a monastery situated on al-Asi (Orontes) River near the city of Hama in Syria, that the monks of this monastery upheld the orthodox faith (defined by the Council of Chalcedon), and that they had never deviated from it, denying that the Maronites were at any time Monothelites. Although some Maronites accept the fact that the Maronites were Monothelites, they give their Monothelitism a rather peculiar interpreta-

tion to make it appear to be in harmony with the faith of Chalcedon. Of these we may mention Maronite Bishop Yusuf Deryan, who admitted to Maronite Monothelitism in his book *Lubab al-Barahin al-Jaliyya 'an Haqiqat Amr al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya* (n.p., 1911).

In support of their claim of having always been adherents to the faith of Chalcedon, Maronites use as a basis for their argument a letter written in 517 and signed by clergymen from Syria Secunda and by the abbot of the Monastery of Marun. This letter was sent to Pope Hormisda, and charged Severus, patriarch of Antioch (d. 538) and his associate Peter, bishop of Apamea, with the massacre of 350 monks. Maronites claim that the victims were from the Monastery of Marun and were killed en route to the shrine of Saint Simon the Stylite, where they were slain because of their adherence to the faith of Chalcedon, and cite other letters written and signed by clergymen from Syria Secunda (including abbots of the Monastery of Marun) which charge Severus of Antioch and his associates with additional crimes. These letters were submitted to the council which met in Constantinople in 536 to condemn Severus and his associates. In sum, Maronites avow that they have perpetually upheld the faith of Chalcedon and that, on the basis of their faith, they were always united with the Church of Rome. For this reason they attempt to discredit those historians—especially tenth-century Sa'id Ibn Batriq (Eutychius), Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, and twelfth-century William of Tyre—who charged the Maronites with Monothelitism. Historical fact, however, reveals that the earliest evidence of adoption of Monothelitism by the monks of the Monastery of Marun was recorded by ninth-century Dionysius Tal Mahri, Syrian Orthodox patriarch of Antioch (d. 845). Tal Mahri dates the Monothelitism of these monks to the years 629-630, at which time the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius imposed Monothelitism on the people of Syria.

Maronites further maintain that their patriarchate is the original patriarchate of Antioch and that John Marun was their first patriarch. They unanimously affirm that in 686, after the death of Theophanes, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, John Marun was chosen for this position. However, they differ over who chose John Marun to be patriarch. Some claim that he was chosen by a delegate of Pope Honorius (d. 638) who happened to be in Syria in the seventh century. Apparently, this delegate examined John Marun's faith and, after finding it orthodox (Chalcedonian), took him to Rome where Pope Honorius ordained him a patriarch in 686. Realizing that Honorius, who died in 638, could not have ordained John Marun a patriarch in 686, al-Duwayhi maintained that it was Pope Sergius, not Honorius, meant in this context and that

the copyist must have mistaken Honorius for Sergius. Others claim that John Marun was chosen patriarch by the Mardaites' bishops. But who are these Mardaites? Maronites were unanimous on these Mardaites or Marada being a warlike people employed by the Byzantine emperors in the seventh and eighth centuries against the Umayyad armies which made incursions into Lebanon. Maronites add that they are descendants of these Mardaites. In other words, the Mardaites and the Maronites are one and the same people. According to this interpretation, it was the bishops of the Mardaites (that is, the Maronites) who chose John Marun and ordained him patriarch of Antioch. This claim has been defended by every Maronite, including the celebrated Joseph Assemani (d. 1768) in the first volume of his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, but most tenaciously by Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs (d. 1907) in his *al-Jamiʿ al-Mafussal fi Tarikh al-Mawarina al-Muʾassal (Comprehensive Collections of the Authentic History of the Maronites)* (Beirut, 1905).

A contemporary Maronite writer puts forth several additional claims. In his *Traikh al-Mawarina al-Dini wa al-Siyasi wa al-Hadari (The Religious, Political and Cultural History of the Maronites)* 1 (Beirut, 1970), Rev. Butrus Daww portrays St. Simon the Stylite as a "disciple" of the fifth-century ascetic Marun and calls him a "Valiant Maronite," and the "fountainhead of heroism in the Maronite nation." More than any other Maronite, Daww theorizes on the concept of the "Maronite Nation" and the Maronite patriarchate, giving the impression that the Maronites were the cornerstone of both asceticism and Syrian nationalism, as well as the foci of Christianity and the Church of Antioch in the East. He endorses all of the claims made by previous Maronites and exerts considerable effort to amplify them. Maronite claims have been challenged by clergymen of the Uniate (Roman Catholic) churches in the East since the eighteenth century, but none has attempted to refute Maronite claims so thoroughly as Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud of the Syrian Roman Catholic Church. Dawud wrote a monograph in Latin to challenge Maronite claims of perpetual orthodoxy (adherence to the faith of Chalcedon). This led Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs to write a book entitled *Ruh al-Rudud fi Tafnid Zaʿm al-Khuri Dawud (Summa Confutationum Contra Assertiones Sacerdotis Joseph David)* (Beirut, 1871) published in both Arabic and Latin, to refute Dawud's objections. In turn, Dawud devoted an entire manuscript, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj al-Rahina fi Ibtal Daʿawa al-Mawarina* (completed in Mosul, Iraq, in 1873) in refutation of Maronite claims. The manuscript was later published in Leipzig in 1908, with the French subtitle *Recueil de Documents et de Preuves Contre la Prétendue Orthodoxie Perpétuelle des Maronites.*

Although Dawud's work is the most comprehensive book written in the Arabic language in refutation of Maronite claims, the author neglects the most important Maronite claim, the Chalcedonian "orthodoxy" based on the letters signed by abbots of the Monastery of Marun which charge Severus, patriarch of Antioch, and Peter of Apamea with killing 350 monks. In only one place, however, and only in a footnote, Dawud mentions the letter of the clergymen from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda. He does so not to challenge the charge against Severus but only to demonstrate that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were using the Trisagion (the hymn of thrice holy, that is, Holy Thou art God, Holy Thou art Mighty, Holy Thou art Immortal, have mercy upon us), with the phrase "Thou who wast crucified for us," which the Church of Rome considers as "heretical." He concludes that the monks of Marun who used this phrase were not orthodox (Chalcedonians).

These, then, are the claims Maronites made to establish a legitimate foundation for their church and community. However, certain aspects of Maronite interpretation of history are open to question, particularly the claim that their church is "the Church of Antioch," the claim to Chalcedonian orthodoxy, and the identity of John Marun. Furthermore, due to political and communal reasons throughout their history, Maronite writers have endeavored to establish an organic tie with the Church of Rome which has led them to substantial historiographical revisionism and reinterpretation particularly in recent centuries. Such revisionism, in a communal sense, was also a quest for distinct identity. This quest by the Maronites for a distinct identity continues until this day.

I

Origin of the Term Maronite

THE TERM Maronite poses a problem of identity. Despite the fact that today in Lebanon and other parts of the world the name Maronite is applied to a large Christian denomination affiliated with the Church of Rome, since the fifteenth century this sect has endeavored to find a legitimate derivation as a separate entity from the rest of the Eastern churches. Several questions enter into the quest for identity: whether a church by this name existed from antiquity; whether its name was taken from an individual or monastery; and when and how this denomination became affiliated with the Church of Rome. Maronite writers have offered essays to consider these questions, but the simplest answers are often in conflict.

The eleventh-century Maronite writer Tuma (Thomas), bishop of Kfartab, in his *Ten Treatises,* states that the term Maronite derived from *Maran,* a Syriac term meaning "Our Lord Jesus Christ," and that *Maran* was the name of a monastery after which the Maronites were named.[1] This opinion is also held by Jabra'il Ibn al-Qila'i, Maronite bishop of Nicosia (d. 1516), whose belief was that the name Maronite was derived from the Syriac *Morio,* meaning Lord (Christ).[2] Maronite writer Murhij Nirun al-Bani (Faustus Nairon, d. 1711), however, was of the opinion that the term Maronite (in Syriac, *Moronoye*), as Tuma had believed, came from the Monastery of Marun named after a fifth-century ascetic, and became commonly applied to anyone who followed the faith of the

monks of the Monastery of Marun (which was also the affirmed faith of the Council of Chalcedon). He also points out that before the end of the seventh century the Maronites were called Mardaites or Marada but after that time were called Maronites.[3]

But no Maronite writer has attempted more carefully the explanation of the origin and derivation of the term Maronite than the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704). He devoted two chapters to this subject in his history of the Maronites entitled *Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya* (Beirut, 1890). Al-Duwayhi considered both the ideas of Maronite and non-Maronite sources and sifted the evidence offered by both. He discredited the claims of those who maintained that the Maronites were named after Marun, a fifth-century Syrian monk, and he rejected the statement of the tenth-century Malkite (Chalcedonian) patriarch of Alexandria, Sa'id Ibn Batriq (Eutychius d. 941), that the Maronites derived their name from a monk named Marun in the time of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice (582—602). This latter Marun was a Monothelite who, because he held that in Christ there was but one will and one voluntary operation, is considered a heretic by Maronites. He also gives good reason for rejecting the opinions of such Latin scholars as Baronius and such Maronites as al-Sihyuni (Gabriel Sionita, d. 1648), who believed that the Maronites were named after a town called Marun in the village of Antioch.[4] Perhaps al-Duwayhi was anxious to discredit this Marun for less than objective reasons since he is especially keen in his book to exonerate his own community and church from any taint of the Monothelite "heresy." At the same time he does not agree with al-Qila'i, who defended the opinion that the term Maronite derived from the Syriac term *Morio,* "The Lord." Al-Duwayhi holds that the monastery in Syria was named after Christ and that the Maronites took their name from this monastery.[5] Al-Duwayhi states, however, that the term *Morio* (Lord) is correct only insofar as it indicates the correctness of the faith of the Maronites. In other words, the Maronites and their monastery were so named because of their "orthodox" faith in terms of the formula defined by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which states that the two natures of Christ, the divine and the human, were united in one person but remained separate in their union.[6] Al-Duwayhi also favors another opinion which is "in harmony with the tradition of the Maronite Church and approved by the Church of Rome as evidenced by the Maronite prayer books."[7]—an opinion advanced by al-Qila'i that the Maronites were named after the pious Marun, "Patriarch of Great Antioch." This is confusing, for al-Qila'i also writes that the Maronites

derived their name from the term *Morio,* the "Lord Christ," which indicates that their monastery was also known by this name. The confusion notwithstanding, if, by the monastery *"Morio,"* al-Qilaʿi was referring to the traditional Monastery of Marun, his allegation becomes the more incredible since historians accept the claim of some Maronites that this monastery was built in the fifth century on the river al-Asi (Orontes) in Syria, and the pious Marun who allegedly became the "first Patriarch" of the Maronites lived in the second half of the seventh century and died in 707. Moreover, al-Qilaʿi is wrong in calling this man, "Marun." We shall see that his fellow Maronites claim that their first patriarch was a monk at the Monastery of Marun, but his name was Yuhanna (John) and that he became the first patriarch of the Maronites in the early seventh century. He was called Marun after the name of the monastery.

In his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (1, 507) celebrated Maronite writer Joseph Assemani notes that Istefan al-Duwayhi and Faustus Nairon claim that the Marada (Mardaites of Theophanes) were called Maronites in the year 694 because they followed John Marun, the "first Patriarch of the Maronites." A similar observation was made by the author of the Maronite book *al-Huda* (Nomocanon), who stated "the Maronite denomination is attributed to Marun Yuhanna [sic], the patriarch of great Antioch."[8] Assemani disputed these opinions and maintained that the Maronites were called by this name in the seventh century, not after Yuhanna Marun who became their "first Patriarch" in that century, but after the fifth-century ascetic, Saint Marun. He states: "The Lebanese dropped the name Mardaites and were called Maronites after Marun whose famous monastery was built near Hama. Their Patriarch Yuhanna [John] was also called after this monastery."[9]

From this statement we learn that before the seventh century the Maronites were called Mardaites named Maronites, and when they chose a monk named Yuhanna from the Monastery of Marun to be their patriarch, they dropped the name Mardaites and adopted the name Maronites. According to Assemani, the term "Maronite" did not indicate a well-defined group or community prior to the seventh century. Thus there is no difference between Assemani's opinion and that of al-Duwayhi and Faustus Nairon. In at least one important aspect—whether the Maronites were called by this name after a fifth-century saint, Marun, or after a monastery named after this saint, or after the seventh-century monk, Yuhanna Marun, as al-Duwayhi claims—the fact is that, according to Assemani, the Maronites were not known by this name before the seventh century, but were called Mardaites. These Mardaites

were not even originally a religious sect as were the Arians or the Nestorians, but rather a militant people who were employed by Byzantine rulers to fight the Arabs.

Another interesting theory is that of Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs (d. 1907), who tried to establish the term "Maronite" on a purely theological basis. He states that in the fifth century in Syria, when a growing number of "heretics" began to persecute the "Catholics," the disciples of Saint Marun defended the "Catholic" faith against its opponents. The result was that those who accepted the "Catholic" faith through the efforts of the disciples of Marun were "contemptuously called Maronites by their opponents who rejected the Catholic faith."[10]

What al-Dibs meant by the "Catholic" faith in this context is the formula "line" of the Church of Rome as well as that of those churches which accepted the councils' edicts. Al-Dibs's attempt to establish the origin of the Maronite Church and community on the basis of dogmatic disputes which divided the church into opposing camps contradicts the theory of al-Duwayhi and Assemani that the Maronites were called Mardaites before the seventh century, implying as it does that all the people of Lebanon were Maronites from the time of the fifth century. Further, according to al-Dibs, in the seventh century these Maronites rebelled against both the Arabs and the Byzantine Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus (685–695). Because of this action, their enemies as well as their neighbors called them Marada, or Mardaites meaning "rebels."[11] Obviously, al-Duwayhi and Assemani affirm that from the fifth century the people of Lebanon were called Mardaites, but that this name was dropped in the seventh century and the name Maronite was adopted. Disputing this, al-Dibs claims that the Maronites were known by this name since the fifth century, but in the seventh century because of their rebellion they were referred to as Mardaites.[12]

From the foregoing we may deduce the following: some Maronite scholars have attempted to attribute the origin of the name of their church and community to at least two Maruns, one an early-fifth-century ascetic and saint, the other a late-seventh-century monk surnamed Yuhanna (John) Marun who became their first patriarch. They further claim that the Maronites were called Mardaites but dropped this name in the seventh century in favor of the name Maronites. Others claim that their name derives from a monastery named after the fifth-century Marun. Al-Dibs, on the other hand, believes that the Maronites were called by this name from the fifth century but, because they rebelled against the Byzantine state in the seventh century, they were called Mar-

daites or Marada. All claim that the Maronites adhered to the "Catholic" faith, the faith of the Church of Rome. We shall see later that these claims have no historical foundation.

2

The Identity of the Ascetic Marun

WHO WAS the first Marun and what was his relationship with the Maronites? Most Maronite writers claim that the first Marun was a fifth-century ascetic who was also the "Father of the Maronite nation." They support their claim by referring to two sources from the first half of the fifth century. One of these sources is a letter which the celebrated Saint John Chrysostom presumably wrote to the Marun from his place of exile in Armenia.[1] In this letter, addressed to "the ascetic priest Marun," Chrysostom expresses his friendly feelings toward Marun and his wish to correspond frequently which was prevented by the difficulty of finding letter carriers. He earnestly inquires about Marun's health and closes by asking Marun to pray for him.

Unfortunately, the letter is not dated. This fact has caused Maronite writers to speculate about its date. Some have claimed that it was written either in 404 or 405, while others thought it was written between 404 and 407, the year John Chrysostom died. A contemporary writer, Yusuf Muzhir, set the date of this letter in the year 414.[2] This is obviously in error since Chrysostom could not have written a letter seven years after his death. Muzhir makes yet another incredible claim in order to prove that Marun's faith was that of a true "Catholic" and not a "Monothelite heretic." The two friends, John Chrysostom and the ascetic Marun, he claims, were adherents to the Council of Chalcedon, whose definition of faith they vigorously defended. This is impossible, since the

Council of Chalcedon met in 451, many decades after the deaths of both Chrysostom (407) and Marun, whose death most probably occurred in 410.[3]

The letter in question was addressed to a certain "Marun the Ascetic" without further identification. It was the custom of the early church fathers to address their letters to individuals identifying them by church rank or function. This letter attributed to Chrysostom could have been written to any one of several ascetics named Marun who lived in Syria during the fifth century.[4] What really refutes the letter as evidence, however, is its language, which is so generalized and superficial that it could never have been written by Chrysostom, a distinguished Biblical scholar and orator. Chrysostom refers to Marun as a priest, and there is no evidence that the fifth-century ascetic Marun had ever held such a church office. Even if we agree with Maronite writers that this Marun was a friend of John Chrysostom, it proves only that Chrysostom had an ascetic and pious friend named Marun; beyond their alleged friendship we know nothing about this Marun, his activities, or his fame as a great ascetic. Indeed, the letter is so dubious that even al-Duwayhi could not determine the origin of any possible relationship between Chrysostom and Marun. He could not find recorded evidence of any kind. He does speculate, however, that Chrysostom might have been the schoolmate of Marun in Antioch before both took up the ascetic life, or that when Chrysostom occupied the Patriarchal See of Constantinople he paid a visit to Syria to admonish those who worshipped the sun, and he may have met Marun and they became friends.[5] Obviously, such speculations are of little historical value.

The second source which Maronite writers cite to substantiate their claim that the fifth-century Marun was the "Father" of their church and community, and the same Marun associated with John Chrysostom, is the *Religiosa Historia* by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus (d. 458). Theodoret was a student of the theological school of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 427) and a strong opponent of Saint Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, champion of orthodoxy at the Council of Ephesus (431).[6] A product of the theological school of Antioch and much influenced by the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret became very active in the heated controversy between Nestorius, his close friend, and Cyril. In doing so, he vehemently championed the heresy of the former, although he was forced to condemn Nestorius at the Council of Chalcedon in 451.

Theodoret was a learned man, a recognized theologian, and a prolific writer. His *Religiosa Historia* contains an account of about thirty

ascetics and anchorites, with some of whom he was personally acquainted. Included in the book is the austere life of a certain ascetic named Marun.[7]

The importance of Theodoret's account of Marun is that it is the only source which describes the ascetic life of someone named Marun. Theodoret was a contemporary of Marun, and there is no reason to discredit his account of him, despite the fact that he had no personal contact with him and only knew of Marun from Jacob, one of his followers. Theodoret tells us that when Marun decided to live a life of austerity, he climbed to the top of a mountain in the district of Cyrus where there was an abandoned pagan temple. He dedicated this temple to the worship of God and visited it frequently. Close by he built a crude hovel which, however, he inhabited only briefly. Within a short time he became known for his austerity, piety, and healing power, which later attracted people from all over Syria. Because of his reputed divine power, it was rumored that even devils shunned his presence. When he died his devotees fought for possession of his body, whose fate was finally decided when one of the contending groups was able to capture it and build a temple over its burial site. Theodoret states that even in his time the people continued to celebrate the memory of Marun.[8]

Theodoret never mentions the date of Marun's death or whether he himself ever visited the site of his burial. The biography of Marun is very brief and, when compared with his biographies of Saint Simon the Stylite or even Jacob, a follower of Marun, it is rather insignificant. He affords Marun no special place or excellence in the austere life practiced by thousands of monks and holy men from the western Egyptian desert to Mesopotamia.

The history of asceticism in the first few centuries of the Eastern church includes celebrated men such as Pachomius, Antonius, Eugene, Macarius, Saint Ephraim, Saint Simon the Stylite, Saint Barsauma (the chief of the anchorites), Saint Mattai (Matthew of Abjershat, whose monastery stands near Mosul, Iraq, until this day), and many others. But except for Theodoret's brief account about Marun, nothing else is known about him in spite of the claim of most Maronite scholars that this fifth-century ascetic is the "Father" of their denomination. Characteristic of this claim is the inclusion of the probably imaginary picture captioned "Saint Marun, Father of the Maronite Denomination"[9] in al-Duwayhi's history. Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs opens his introduction to *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal:* "Therefore, we begin the history of the Maronites by discussing Saint Marun, who is considered the Father and patron of this denomination."[10]

Theodoret's account of Marun indicates that he was one of a host of monks and anchorites in Syria in the fourth and fifth centuries, and, as already pointed out, nothing in his work suggests that Marun had achieved such a high degree of piety as to gain him the eminent position attributed to him by later Maronite writers. While al-Duwayhi makes him the "head of all ascetics and monasteries in the district of Cyrus," a contemporary Maronite writer, Rev. Butrus Daww, goes even a step further by claiming that he was the "head of a distinct school of asceticism."[11]

Through misinterpretation of sources, Daww, citing A. J. Festugière, *Antioche Païenne et Chrétienne*, concludes that Marun was the first in Syria to practice living in the open, exposed to the harshness of the elements,[12] and that some anchorites in the district of Cyrus in northern Syria adopted this mode of living, particularly the stylite monks who chose to live on top of pillars, the most famous of whom was Saint Simon the Stylite (d. 459). Daww states that Festugière considers Saint Simon a disciple of the school of ascetism established by Marun.[13] This theory considering Marun the founder of an "ascetic school" which gave rise to a more rigid asceticism lacks historical substantiation. The point Festugière is probably trying to make is that the ascetic manner of living in the open or on top of a mountain may have led some anchorites to take to living on the tops of pillars, although this, too, is a matter of conjecture. He states:

> A l'extreme opposé des reclus, voici les moines qui vivent en plein air: "Hypèthres," Si l'on puet dire, en empruntant ce terme à la langue des architectes. Les stylites sont du nombre, mais ils ne diffèrent pas essentiellement des moines qui, avant eux, étaient tenus Juchés sur des sommets, ou ils vivaient à ciels découvert. Les stylites sont l'une des espèces des "hypèthres", et ne se distinguent des autres que parce qu'ils sont montés encoure plus haut, et dès lors sont plus exposés et aux regards des hommes et aux intempéries de l'air.

After citing in the same paragraph the names of these recluses, Festugière continues:

> Le fondateur de cette vie "hypèthre" . . . semble y avoir été un certain Maron qui eut beaucoup de disciples, entre autres Jacques et Limnaius: celui-ci se rendit auprès de Marón exactement au meme temps que Jacques.[14]

Festugière establishes no association between the ascetic Marun and Simon the Stylite, nor does he even allude to the latter. Daww uses

the observation above out of context to establish his point that Saint Simon the Stylite was a "pioneer Maronite." He states:

> This great saint is one of the valiant pioneer Maronites. He began to practice asceticism following the Maronite manner after he was expelled from the Monastery of Talʿada . . . Desiring to achieve the highest state of asceticism, he first lived in the open like St. Marun, then moved to the top of a column. Thus, Maronite asceticism was the highest point of his life, as it was the highest point of monastic life as Festugière has maintained.[15]

There is no historical evidence to support this statement. There are two Syriac biographies of Saint Simon the Stylite, together with the accounts of him by Theodoret and Evagrius, none of which mentions Marun or alludes to any relationship between him and the stylite. Furthermore, it is hardly possible that such a relationship could have escaped the attention of Theodor Nöldeke, the eminent Orientalist who has definitively written about the lives of several Syrian saints, including that of Saint Simon the Stylite.[16] Yet Daww claims that not only Saint Simon the Stylite but all the stylite monks were "disciples of Marun."[17] Daww also seems irrelevant when he relates the influence of Saint Simon the Stylite on the "Maronite nation" and Maronite history:

> St. Simon the Stylite had a profound impact on Maronite history and spiritual Maronites. This saint was and still is the fountainhead of heroism in the Maronite nation attested to by the great number of pious men who were motivated to imitate his ascetic life. His spirituality has become an essential element in the Maronite spiritual well-being.[18]

This judgment is without historical ground and depends once more on Festugière, who merely tried to establish the fact that the monastic manner of living in the open begun by Marun may have led other anchorites to live in the open or on top of pillars rather than in cells.[19] The association of the Stylite saint with the "Maronite nation" is historical fantasy.

We have seen that Theodoret mentions no association between Saint Simon the Stylite and the ascetic Marun. Nor does Cosmas, the biographer of Saint Simon, mention any such relationship. Cosmas does say that many pagan people from Mount Lebanon visited the saint and complained to him about evil creatures or wild beasts attacking and devouring people. These wild creatures ravaged homes, snatched children and infants from their mothers' bosoms and killed them. The saint told them that God had delivered them to the beasts because they had forsaken Him, and that they should ask their own gods to deliver them.

Still, the people tearfully imploring, Cosmas continues, the saint finally relented, telling them he would pray for their deliverance if they would promise to forsake the worship of false idols and return to the Christian God. This they promised to do. The saint then instructed them to place on the border of each village four stones, each engraved with three signs of the cross, and to wait for three days. When this was done and the beasts returned and saw these stones, as the story goes, some of them ran away howling and crying, "Woe upon thee, Simon, what hast thou done to us." The people of Mount Lebanon received baptism and accepted Christianity through this miracle wrought by Saint Simon.[20]

Obviously, this apocryphal tale has no relation to the Maronites, their history, or their conversion to Christianity. It does not show that Saint Simon preached Christianity in Lebanon as claimed by some Maronite writers,[21] nor does it indicate that there was a Maronite community in Lebanon in the fifth century.

It is true that Christianity found its way into Lebanon after the first century, but the Christian church did not establish a strong foothold in that country until the fourth century. Christianity spread very slowly, especially in the mountainous areas, where paganism was strong and was not put on the defensive till the time of the Emperor Julian the Apostate (361–363).[22] The people who were attacked by beasts and appealed to Saint Simon for deliverance were most likely pagans from the mountainous region of Lebanon. Theodor Nöldeke's statement that, "it is probable the Maronites are the descendants of the converts who accepted baptism after Simon's intercession, as they believed, had freed them from the ravages of wild beasts," is speculation and lacks historical evidence.[23]

Daww not only tries to make Saint Simon the Stylite a disciple of Marun, indebted to Marun for his mode of asceticism, but also claims that the great church structure built on the site where the stylite lived and the monasteries in its vicinity were Maronite, that is, under Maronite jurisdiction and authority.[24] He avers that in the fifth century the Church of Antioch was divided into two groups: the Chalcedonians and the Monophysites, the latter rejecting the edicts of the Council of Chalcedon. This is true, but Daww continues that this church was divided once more in the first half of the eighth century between the Malkites, the Church of Antioch, which accepted the Council of Chalcedon, and the Maronites. After this division, the church of Saint Simon, as well as the monasteries in its vicinity remained Maronite. He writes:

> Before the division, the Chalcedonian segment of the Church of Antioch, particularly the one whose language was Syriac, was under

> the leadership of the Monastery of Marun, and consequently the Chalcedonian monasteries and churches whose language was Syriac followed the lead of the Monastery of Marun in their defense of the Chalcedonian formula of faith.[25]

Daww's statement lacks historical substantiation particularly in that the Chalcedonian segment of the Church of Antioch was divided into Maronite and Malkite. The Church of Antioch was divided for the first time in the sixth century into two separate groups, the Monophysites "Jacobites" and the Chalcedonian "Malkites." As shall be seen later, the Maronites only became a separate denomination in the eighth century.

3

The Monastery of Marun

THERE IS NOTHING in available ancient sources to indicate the name and location of the place where the ascetic Marun lived. However, one might be tempted, upon reading Theodoret, to conclude that he lived in the vicinity of Cyrus in what was then known as Syria Prima, many miles to the northeast of Antioch. The failure to identify this place caused the Maronites to speculate as to its whereabouts, as did their sympathizers. The Maronite Bishop Pierre Dib states that Marun lived on top of a mountain near Apamea in Syria Secunda, an area far distant from Cyrus.[1] Others claim that Marun lived in a cave near the source of the river Orontes (al-Asi) close to the Hirmil in Lebanon; they cite as evidence the name of the cave known until this day as the cave of Marun.[2]

Father Henri Lammens speculates that Marun lived on top of one of the mountains on the road to Aleppo southeast of Cyrus, although he fails to cite the exact location of this mountain.[3] Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, following Assemani, states that the monastic abode of Marun was situated on the bank of the Orontes River in al-Rastan, somewhere between Hims and Hama.[4] Anyone who is familiar with the geography of Syria will recognize that al-Rastan (Arethusa) was situated on the Orontes, south of Hama and miles away from Cyrus in the farthest north of Syria.[5]

Al-Duwayhi maintains that Marun lived in al-Qurushiyya (the district of Qurush-Cyrus-in-Syria Prima) and that he had identified the name of the mountain on which Marun lived. This mountain, it should be remembered, was first mentioned by Theodoret, who did not identify its name or location. Al-Duwayhi, while still a priest, delivered in Aleppo two sermons in which he identified the mountain on which Marun lived as "Mount Olympus,"[6] but offers no explanation of what he meant by "Mount Olympus." The Reverend Butrus Daww has attempted to identify this "Mount Olympus." He writes that al-Duwayhi often confuses and changes both proper and geographical names, one of which was "Mount Olympus." He says that taking into consideration the distortion of names due to the constant change of language and to copying errors, this "Mount Olympus" of al-Duwayhi is none other than Jabal Simʿan or Qalʿat Simʿan (The Mountain of Simon), fifteen kilometers south of Aleppo.[7] This Jabal Simʿan is the same mountain on which Saint Simon the Stylite lived. After his death in 459, at the site of his mountain grave, was built a magnificent church, of which only ruins remain and among which the pillar on which Saint Simon lived is still visible.[8] Daww elaborates, stating that the "Olympus" of al-Duwayhi is a distortion of *Nabu* or *Yanbu* (in Syriac), which al-Duwayhi mistook for "Olympus." He quotes Charles S. Clermont-Ganneau, who asserts that Jabal Simʿan was formerly known as Jabal Nabu (the Mountain of Nabu). It was called Nabu after a pagan idol worshipped by the inhabitants of a nearby village which had become known as Kfarnabu (that is the village of Nabu).[9] In time the people called the mountain the same name. Daww is not only certain that Jabal Simʿan was formerly called Nabu, but that Marun lived in the village of Kfarnabu and that the temple of Nabu is the same temple averred by Theodoret to have been converted by Marun into a church.[10] Surely, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, was familiar with the towns and villages of his diocese and would have mentioned Kfarnabu if he knew or even if he heard that Marun lived there. The assertion that "Olympus" is a distortion of Nabu, and that this mountain is the same Jabal Simʿan named after the celebrated Saint Simon the Stylite, is in the face of the evidence, difficult to sustain. Indeed there is nothing to substantiate that the ascetic Marun ever lived in a village named Kfarnabu. Such a finding by Daww not only contradicts the account of Theodoret, who states that Marun lived in the open and not in a village, but also contradicts the conclusions of ancient Maronite commentators. The various conclusions of later Maronites, in their attempts to identify the exact name and location of Marun's habi-

tat, arise from the fact that there is no historical evidence. In fact, this uncertainty led to an even graver error in relation to the exact location of the monastery built after Marun's death and named after him. Once more we must refer to Theodoret.

In his brief account of Marun, Theodoret never mentioned the exact place where Morun lived or the date of his death. All that he related was that after Marun's death a fight erupted among the people over his body. Those of the nearby villages finally drove away others and claimed it. They built an enormous temple over the remains of their hero which is in use to this day in honor of his virtuous life.[11] Theodoret does not identify the village whose inhabitants won the fight over Marun's body, nor does he inform us about the place where the body was taken and a large temple built. This gave rise to much specious speculation.

Theodoret referred to a temple and not to a monastery, and it is certain that he knew the difference between the two. Unfortunately, Maronite writers from the time of the seventeenth century have erroneously interpreted Theodoret, especially al-Duwayhi. Though al-Duwayhi recognized that Theodoret mentioned neither the name nor the place where this temple was built, he conjectured that Theodoret was referring to the "temple which the people of Hama built on the Orontes River, somewhere between that city and Hims." He concluded that this temple became the renowned "Monastery of Marun."[12]

But al-Duwayhi is inconsistent on this point. In one instance he states that the "people of Hama" carried off the body of Marun and built a temple which later became a great monastery on the site of its burial, while in another he states that the "people of both Hims and Hama" were the ones who did so.[13] In fifth-century Byzantine Syria, Hims and Hama were by no means to be identified with the obscure villages mentioned by Theodoret. Both were ancient cities which achieved prominence in the Roman empire and were significant urban communities with large populations.[14]

It is more logical to infer from Theodoret's account that the inhabitants of the most heavily populated nearby village carried off the body of Marun to their village and built a temple in his honor. If the place was Hama, Theodoret would have said so. So we have no alternative but to infer from Theodoret that the village was in the district of Cyrus between Hims and Hama in what al-Dibs believes to be al-Rastan.

Al-Duwayhi emphasizes that this Monastery of Marun was one of several known by the same name. This is correct, but there is no evidence that these monasteries were named after Marun, including as al-

Duwayhi claims, the monasteries named Marun near Constantinople and Damascus. There is evidence that there was more than one monastery known as Marun in the vicinity of Hama.[16] Elaborating on Theodoret's account of Marun and quoting the Latin writer Bagius, Assemani in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (1, 497) is of the opinion that the Monastery of Marun was located on the Orontes River between Hims and Hama. This is the same observation which had been made earlier by al-Duwayhi. We know that in Syria Secunda in the fifth and sixth centuries there were more than one ascetics named Marun: the Marun with whom Severus, patriarch of Antioch, communicated; another with whom Jacob of Sarug communicated; and still another Marun of Any-Zarba, to whom Philoxenus of Mabug wrote a letter.[17]

Assemani bases his opinion on the fact that two representatives of the Monastery of Marun attended the Fifth Council which Emperor Justinian I convened in 553. They carried with them a letter which they had signed on behalf of the monks of that monastery; it was addressed to the emperor and to Menas, patriarch of Constantinople. These two delegates presented themselves as the representatives of the Monastery of Saint Marun, "chief among the monasteries of Syria Secunda."[18] This may be true and does not question the existence of a monastery bearing the name of Marun; the question is whether this monastery is the same one built by the ascetic Marun's followers who allegedly carried off his body to a place between Hims and Hama, and whether this monastery became "chief" among all the monasteries of Syria as well as the stronghold for the defense of the Council of Chalcedon. This letter of the two delegates, if historically authentic, does not prove that this monastery is the one Maronites claim to be the Monastery of Marun, from which they attempt to trace their name and origin.

Theodoret never mentioned that the followers of Marun ever left the vicinity of Cyrus to build a monastery or monasteries in or near Apamea in Syria Secunda. He relates, however, that two followers of Marcianus of Cyrus, in Syria Secunda, Eusebius and Agapetus, had built monasteries in Apamea.[19] Father Lammens suggests the possibility that the disciples of Marcianus, who were originally from Cyrus, were the ones who built a monastery named for Marun. But since this contradicts Theodoret's account, Lammens's suggestion is hard to take seriously.[20]

While the majority of Maronites fix the location of the monastery of their Marun between Hims and Hama, Rev. Daww confronts us with a new theory about the location of the Monastery of Marun. He cites

Yaqut al-Hamawi (d. 1229), who, in his *Mu'jam al-Buldan*, twice mentions a monastery called Murran. Yaqut states that in his time the people visited the tomb of the Umayyad Caliph Umar Ibn Abd al-Aziz, located on a mountain called Dayr (monastery) Murran, overlooking the town of Kfartab.[21] In another place Yaqut states that this Dayr Murran is located on the mountain which overlooks Kfartab near al-Ma'arra and is believed by the people to enshrine the tomb of Caliph Umar Ibn Abd al-Aziz.[22]

Daww also cites Ibn Abd al-Haqq (d. 1308), who made a compendium of Yaqut's *Mu'jam al-Buldan* entitled *Marasid al-Ittila' fi Asma al-Amkina Wa al-Biqa'*, but Ibn Abd al-Haqq adds nothing new to Yaqut's statement about the location of the Monastery of Murran. However, he states that he visited the site and inquired of the inhabitants of al-Ma'arra the location of the tomb of the Caliph Umar Ibn Abd al-Aziz. He was told that the monastery which enshrines the tomb is known as the Nuqayra (Nikirta) Monastery, from which Daww concludes that it is probably the Monastery of Murran.[23]

Though there is nothing in this observation to indicate that the Dayr (monastery) Murran is the Monastery of Marun, Daww is sure that the two monasteries are one and the same.[24] This contradicts the Maronites' claim that the location of the Monastery of their Marun is al-Rastan between Hims and Hama in Syria Secunda while the towns of al-Ma'arra (Ma'arrat al-Nu'man) and Kfartab are many miles away in northern Syria. Furthermore, no Maronite has ever claimed that their Monastery of Marun enshrines the tomb of the Umayyad Caliph Umar Ibn Abd al-Aziz. Thus Daww contradicts both his predecessors by boldly affirming that "this is the location of the prominent Monastery of Marun, which played an important role in the history of the Church in Syria and was the origin and the nucleus of the Maronite Church."[25] He also contradicts the fourteenth-century writer Ibn Mahmud al-Katib al-Dimashqi who states that the Monastery of Murran was situated outside the city of Damascus.[26]

Daww quotes al-Mas'udi to show that the Monastery of Marun is situated near the Urnut (Orontes) River east of Hama and Shayzar (Larissa),[27] but Hama and Shayzar are many miles south of al-Ma'arra and Kfartab. Daww's citing of al-Mas'udi defeats his purpose because al-Mas'udi clearly states that the tomb of the Caliph Umar Ibn Abd al-Aziz was in the Monastery of Sim'an (Simon) in the province of Hims near the district of Qinnesrin.[28] This also contradicts Yaqut's statement that the caliph was buried in Dayr Murran.

We have seen that the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi, interpreting Theodoret's account of Marun, states that the inhabitants of Hama carried off the body of the ascetic and built a temple on its burial ground at the bend of the Orontes River, which became in a short time a great monastery accommodating eight hundred monks.[29] This view is supported by other Maronites, including Assemani. Yet Daww also indicates that the Byzantine Emperor Marcian, who came to power in 451, built the Monastery of Marun. He cites Abu al-Fida (d. 1331) who, in his *al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar*, relates that Marcian succeeded Theodosius II and reigned seven years. A year after assuming power he built the Monastery of Marun in Hims.[30] Daww conjectures that because this monastery was built by the emperor it was destined to occupy "first place" among the monasteries of Syria Secunda. He is emphatic that one of the reasons which motivated the emperor to build this monastery was "the role which the Maronites began to play in leading the Syriac-Aramaic segment of the Syrian people."[31]

He explains that the majority of the Christians in Syria from apostolic times to the beginning of the fifth century were city dwellers whose culture and language were Greek. From the fourth century on, however, the message of the Gospel spread among the villages and country people, who were Syriac by language and culture and comprised the majority of the inhabitants. Thus, Daww reasons, by their conversion to Christianity through the efforts of the Maronite monks, "the balance turned in favor of the Aramaic segment of the population of Syria under the leadership of the monks." He concludes that for this reason the Emperor Marcian built the monastery in order to win the monks to his side, that is, to support the Council of Chalcedon which he had called, and to prevent the Syrian people under the influence of Maronite monks from "switching to Monophysitism," which was becoming popular among the Syrians.[32]

Another opinion advanced by Daww as to why Marcian built the Monastery of Marun on that particular spot is its proximity to the desert where the pagan Bedouins lived. It was an important mission of the evangelical Christians to convert the Bedouins to Christianity, to civilize them, and to integrate them into the Roman empire.[33]

Abu al-Fida derives his information from the history of Abu Isa Ahmad Ibn Ali al-Munajjim entitled *Kitab al-Bayan 'an Tarikh Sinii Zaman al-'Alam 'ala Sabil al-Hujja wa al-Burhan*.[34] Thus Abu al-Fida is the only writer whose work is extant to claim that the Emperor Marcian built the Monastery of Marun, and his information is secondhand. What makes us believe that Abu al-Fida's claim is extremely weak is that no

other source has ever mentioned that the Emperor Marcian was the one who built the Monastery of Marun.[35]

Even on this point it is difficult to agree with Abu al-Fida that the Emperor Marcian built the Monastery of Marun. He may have confused Marcian with the Emperor Justinian I, whom we learn from Procopius (Book 5, Chapter 8) had renovated the Monastery of Marun. Procopius's observation is of no great help since he does not identify which Monastery of Marun was being renovated by Justinian. Be that as it may, Daww's deduction concerning reasons for which Marcian built the Monastery of Marun are historically unfounded.

Abu al-Fida's belief that the Emperor Marcian built the Monastery of Marun, and which belief Daww follows, contradicts the theory held by some Maronites, especially Istephan al-Duwayhi, that the inhabitants of "Hims and Hama" had built this monastery.[36] Even more confusing is Abu al-Fida's assertion that the Monastery of Marun was situated in Hims. Father Lammens realized that the problem of the identity of the Monastery of Marun became greater "if we fixed the location of the Monastery of Marun in Hims."[37] He believes that this monastery was located not in Hims, nor halfway between this city and Hama, but on the Orontes River, a short distance to the north beyond Hama. He tends to believe that al-Masʿudi, in his book *al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf,* is not too far from the truth when he states that this monastery was located to the east of Shayzar (Larissa) near the Urnut (Orontes), which is the river of Hims and Hama.[38]

Lammens introduces another source which he believes is more authentic in determining the location of the Monastery of Marun. He refers to the Reverend François Nau, who determined that the Monastery of Marun was "near Apamea in the Orontes valley."[39] To further substantiate his thesis Lammens, like many Maronite writers, refers to the massacre of 350 monks from the Monastery of Marun on their way to visit the shrine or the monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite. (Lammens's source here is a letter he claims was addressed by the monks of Marun to Pope Hormisda in 517). Because of this incident Lammens concludes that the relationship between the monks of Marun and those of Saint Simon the Stylite must have been strong and, consequently, the two monasteries were located close to each other. However, Lammens is not sure how far these two monasteries were from each other.[40] He states that one could reasonably object that the distance between the two is still too far to allow any easy communication. Consequently, Lammens concludes, "it is obvious that the Monastery of Marun was located farther north according to the evidence produced."[41] The basis of his claim—that

350 massacred monks came from there—together with his thesis of the proximity of the Monasteries of Marun and Saint Simon is tenuous and unconvincing.

Lammens's indecisiveness in determining the origin of the Monastery of Marun is reflected in his serious consideration of the possibility that the Monastery of Marun was built near Apamea by Agapetus, the follower of Marcianus. He recognizes Rev. F. M. Jullien as the originator of this idea and states that there is no reason to deny Jullien's theory that Agapetus was the one who built the Monastery of Marun, since a study of geographical sites in Syria does not refute this idea.[42] In a geographical sketch of the life of Saint Marun, Lammens clearly states that Marcianus, a follower of Marun, sent one of his disciples, Agapetus, to build monasteries in the district of Apamea in Nikirta, a rather large town, and that this Agapetus built two monasteries in or near the city.[43] The name of one of these monasteries is not known to us, but the other was named after the celebrated Saint Simon the Stylite.[44] There is no evidence that the other of these monasteries was named after Marun.

There is still another theory about the identity of the Monastery of Marun, advanced by the Jesuit Father Martinus, who devoted most of his life to the study of Lebanon and its history. Martinus states that it is not improbable that a priest—the ascetic Marès (or Mari in the Greek), who lived in the district of Apamea and to whom Saint John Chrysostom addressed a letter, is the Marun to whom Chrysostom also addressed another letter. Martinus hypothesizes this because of the similarity of the spelling of the two names. Marès or Mari held joint abbacy with a certain Simon (not the Stylite already mentioned) of a monastery named Simon and was the founder of the monastery which later came to be known as the Monastery of Marun or Mari. Martinus admits, however, that substantiating historical evidence is lacking, concluding that it is probable that people did not distinguish between the ascetic Marun and his follower Marcianus, who is referred to in some sources as Marian.[45] Father Lammens does not agree with Martinus that Marès and Marun might be identical, but he does concur that there is a similarity between the names Marcianus and Marian. He conjectures that, because of Marcianus's fame as a saintly person, his contemporaries built a church in his name. Father Lammens asks if it is not possible, therefore, that some of Marcianus's followers who came to Apamea built a monastery to honor him there. If this were true, the problem of the identity of the Monastery of Marun would be solved, and it would become evident that one of the monasteries in Apamea was named after Marun, who died and was buried in the district of Cyrus in Syria Prima. However, Lam-

mens seems to obviate these considerations in holding to the opinion that from the beginning of the sixth century the Monastery of Marun was known only by that name.[46]

Several conclusions may be deduced from the foregoing opinions and speculations. The evidence addressed by Maronites and those who support their claims that there existed in the fifth century in Syria Secunda a Monastery of Marun whose monks were Chalcedonians, is untenable. Maronites (and others) cannot even agree on who built the Monastery of Marun or its exact location. Most of the evidence they do produce has no historical foundation. Historical fact does indicate, however, that there were several monasteries named Marun in Syria, but not that they were named after the particular ascetic Marun. More important, available evidence does not support the claim that there was a Maronite community in Syria before the seventh, or even eighth century. While historical evidence does support the thesis that the pious anchorite named Marun lived, died, and was buried in the district of Cyrus in northern Syria, there is nothing to indicate that this Marun ever founded a religious community or inspired the name Maronite. Further, there is no evidence that he or his followers ever built a monastery in his name. Those Maronites who describe their ascetic Marun as "the Father of the Maronite Nation" do so from the totally sentimental predisposition rather than assert it as a claim derived from objective fact.

4

Earliest Sources on the Monastery of Marun

So far we have seen that the earliest source to identify the fifth century ascetic Marun was Theodoret of Cyrus. But Theodoret never mentioned that this Marun or any of his followers had built a monastery in his name. We have also seen that the efforts of writers to date the Monastery of Marun from the fifth century are sheer speculation. However, we have three historical documents which refer to a Monastery of Marun in Syria Secunda. The earliest of these documents is that of Syrian Patriarch of Antioch Dionysius Tal Mahri (d. 845); the second, of Sa'id Ibn Batriq (d. 941), Chalcedonian or Malkite patriarch of Alexandria; and the third, of the Arab historian Abu al-Hasan al-Mas'udi (d. 956). While the testimonies of these three differ from each other in varying degrees, they have one thing in common: all of them refer to a Monastery of Marun related to the doctrine of one-will-in-Christ (Monothelitism), which the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius (d. 641) intended to enforce in Syria as a means of reconciling the Chalcedonians with their opponents so as to preserve the hopes and the integrity of the empire.

Tal Mahri states that after Heraclius removed the Persians from Syria he visited the city of Orhoi (Edessa) in 628. This city was a center of Syriac Christianity and was mostly inhabited by anti-Chalcedonians or Monophysites. The emperor wanted to win these people to the side of the Chalcedonians. On a festival day he attended the service at the Syrian Cathedral in the city, but the officiating bishop, Isaiah, refused him

Holy Communion unless he would forswear the Council of Chalcedon and anathematize the *Tome* of Leo (Pope Leo I, 440–461). The emperor, enraged, expelled the bishop from the cathedral and gave it over to the Chalcedonian party.[1]

In 629 the emperor visited the city of Mabug (present-day Manbij in Syria) where he met with the Syrian patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius (commonly known as Gammala, d. 631), and twelve of his bishops to discuss matters related to the faith.[2] The emperor had previously written to the patriarch concerning doctrinal matters and had received a reply from him,[3] but now he found it more opportune to meet the patriarch and his bishops in person. He hoped to convince them that the new formula of faith he was proposing, which maintained that there was in Christ two natures united in one will, was in conformity with the doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria. After twelve days of debate, the patriarch and his bishops rejected the emperor's formula of faith on the ground that it was not different from the formula of Nestorius (two separate natures and persons in Christ) or from that of Leo (two natures in Christ united in one person, yet remaining separate after their union). The emperor angrily reacted to this rebuff by issuing orders that anyone who rejected the faith of Chalcedon would have his nose and ears cut off and his home pillaged. The persecution of the anti-Chalcedonian (Monophysite) Syrians now began in earnest with the result, as Tal Mahri states, that: "Many monks accepted the Council of Chalcedon including the monks of Beth Marun [the Monastery of Marun] together with the inhabitants of Mabug, [Manbij] Hims and the majority of the people in South Syria who, displaying cruelty, accepted the Council of Chalcedon and seized several of our churches and monasteries."[4]

This was, to be sure, the first time that an ancient historian referred to the Monastery of Marun; however, Tal Mahri does not identify this Monastery of Marun or its location. We may infer that he was intending a monastery by this name in Syria Secunda, although this is not made clear in his statement. The important point is that the name of the Marun monastery first appears in the time of the Emperor Heraclius in the first half of the seventh century and in a very particular context—Monothelitism. This does not solve the problem, however, of whether this monastery was the same one which Maronites allege had been in existence since the middle of the fifth century.

The second document which sheds light on the identity of the Monastery of Marun was produced by the tenth century chronicler Saʿid Ibn Batriq, Malkite patriarch of Alexandria. He wrote a lengthy history including both secular and church affairs up to the year 938. Like Tal

Mahri, Ibn Batriq mentions the Monastery of Marun in association with the doctrine of Monothelitism, but unlike him, he dates this association to the time of Emperor Maurice (582—602), who preceded Heraclius on the throne. Moreover, while Tal Mahri mentions nothing about the location of the Monastery of Marun, Ibn Batriq states that the people of Hama who followed Marun built a monastery in their city and named it after him. The problem is that this Marun of Ibn Batriq cannot be the same ascetic described by Theodoret of Cyrus in the fifth century, nor can it be the same monastery Maronite writers claim was built by the followers of the ascetic Marun between Hims and Hama. It surely contradicts the much later account of Abu al-Fida who stated that the Monastery of Marun was built by the Byzantine Emperor Marcian in 452. The point is that Ibn Batriq confronts us with two new propositions: a different Marun, a Monothelite by faith who died in the time of the Emperor Maurice, and a Monastery of Marun that came into existence during this period.[5]

The problem with the testimony of Ibn Batriq is that he does not cite his source. He could not have copied the work of Tal Mahri because his account is quite different from the latter, although the two agree on associating the Monastery of Marun and its monks with Monothelitism. But who is this Marun of Ibn Batriq, a Monothelite, and as such to contemporary Maronites, an avowed heretic?[6]

Some Maronite writers are of the opinion that this Marun of Ibn Batriq was a Nestorian monk who lived in Orhoi (Edessa, present-day Urfa in Turkey) in the time of the Byzantine Emperor Maurice and who was a teacher of the doctrine of Monothelitism. They base their evidence on the treatises written by the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Anastasius (559–570), in refutation of Monothelitism taught by this Nestorian monk. The Maronite priests Bernardus Ghubayra al-Ghaziri and Mikha'il Shababi are of the opinion that this Marun was the originator of the Monothelite "heresy," which he spread among the Maronites, beginning with the monks of the Monastery of Marun from where it filtered into Syria stopping short of Lebanon.[7] These two priests contend that although the Monothelite doctrine spread in east Syria, particularly in Edessa, the Maronites of Lebanon were free from it. The opinion of al-Ghaziri and Shababi does not, however, solve the problem of the identity of the Monastery of Marun and its monks; it only complicates it by introducing another Marun, a Nestorian monk and a Monothelite. This corroborates our earlier suggestion that there were several ascetics named Marun living in Syria and that the Marun claimed by Maronites to be theirs could be any one of them. Furthermore, there is no evidence that

this Nestorian monk had ever spread the Monothelite heresy in Syria and that the monks of the Monastery of Marun had embraced it. We know that Monothelitism as a distinct theological doctrine emerged in the first half of the seventh century, while this Nestorian was a sixth-century monk, and, like the Chalcedonian patriarch, Anastasius, who was the first to refer to him as a Monothelite, he was a contemporary of the Emperor Maurice. The monks of the Monastery of Marun did not adopt Monothelitism until the time of the Emperor Heraclius. Therefore, to claim, as do al-Ghaziri and Shababi, that this Nestorian monk named Marun spread Monothelitism in Syria and that consequently this doctrine was adopted by the monks of the Monastery of Marun is rather nonsensical. It has led some writers, not familiar with the facts, to draw faulty conclusions that Ibn Batriq was referring not to Yuhanna (John) Marun, but to the sixth-century Nestorian monk Marun of Edessa.[8] Indeed, Ibn Batriq did mean John Marun who, it is believed, died in 707, and whom Maronites claim to have been abbot of the Monastery of Marun as well as their first patriarch. If, by Marun, Ibn Batriq meant the Nestorian monk from Edessa he would have said so. He did not, however, and because he was a learned man and knowledgeable in such matters, we can only conclude that he meant the late seventh-century John Marun.

It is specious to contend, as did the Maronite bishop, Yusuf al-Dibs, that Ibn Batriq attributed the name, Maronite, to a "heretic" because of "envy and malice."[9] Al-Dibs insists that Ibn Batriq was wrong not only because the Monastery of Marun was named after the ascetic Saint Marun not John Marun, but because Monothelitism began in Constantinople in 628, not earlier, concluding that the account of Ibn Batriq is a "dirty invention."[10] Ibn Batriq, who was the Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria, must have known about the Christian communities in Syria. His book must have been known by people and scholars from other denominations, especially the anti-Chalcedonian Copts of Egypt and the Nestorians. We know that Severus Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, a tenth-century Coptic bishop of the Ashmunin, had written a treatise refuting the writings of Ibn Batriq concerning Christian doctrine.[11] This indicates that Ibn Batriq must have been quite familiar with the different facets of dogma held by the Christian denominations. It is unlikely that he erred in attributing Monothelitism to the Maronites.[12]

Unfortunately, Ibn Batriq, first to state that a Monastery of Marun was built by the inhabitants of Hama in the time of the Emperor Maurice, did not indicate his source. If we consult the work of Tal Mahri, we find no date cited for the building of the Monastery of Marun

or for its location. Since Tal Mahri places the Monothelitism advocacy of the monks of that monastery in the early period of the Emperor Heraclius, we may safely infer that this monastery of Ibn Batriq was the same one referred to by Tal-Mahri, except that its monks became Monothelites in the time of Heraclius rather than Maurice. One cannot dismiss, out of hand, the statements of Ibn Batriq since evidence indicates the existence of a second Marun by the name of Yuhanna (John), whom the Maronites themselves claim was their patriarch, although they absolve him from being a Monothelite.[13]

We have yet more evidence which sheds light not only on the religious affiliations of Ibn Batriq's Marun, but also gives the exact location of the monastery by this name. This testimony is by the tenth-century Arab historian Abu al-Hasan al-Masʿudi. In his book, *al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf*, he states that in the time of the Emperor Maurice a native of Hama named Marun had followers (Christian Maronites), and that there was a great monastery named after him east of the cities of Hama and Shayzar. But this monastery, which once contained three hundred cells and was very rich, was finally ruined by the successive raids of the unruly Bedouins and the tyranny of the Sultan. Concerning the religious belief of this Marun, al-Masʿudi states that his ideas regarding the will of Christ and other doctrinal matters distinguished him from other Christians. He maintained that Christ had two natures, one person and one will, which al-Masʿudi remarks was a middle course between the Nestorians, who maintained two natures and two persons in Christ, and the Malkites, who held that the two natures of Christ were united in one person yet remained separate after their union, in accordance with the definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon.[14]

The first thing of note about al-Masʿudi's account is its similarity to that of Ibn Batriq; which is due to the fact that al-Masʿudi had seen and read Ibn Batriq's history in Egypt.[15] Unlike Ibn Batriq, however, al-Masʿudi was a traveler who probably visited the ruins of the Monastery of Marun. Al-Masʿudi says nothing about who built this monastery,[16] but, like Ibn Batriq, he determines its founding as being during the reign of the Emperor Maurice and associates the rise of Monothelitism with it. More importantly, he gives the exact location of this monastery as being east of Hama and Shayzar (present-day Shayjar) near the Orontes River. There is, therefore, no contradiction between him and Ibn Batriq, whose statement that the Monastery of Marun was built in Hama would suggest that it may have been built ir the vicinity of that city. The problem still remains, however, as to who built this monastery and when they did so. As shown earlier, the followers of the fifth-century ascetic Marun

never built a monastery in his name. And if Ibn Batriq's statement that the inhabitants of Hama were the ones who built this monastery, and the much later statement of Abu al-Fida that Marcian built this monastery are discarded, the questions remain: Who built it? And when?

The single most significant fact about the above men is that they agree that the Monastery of Marun appeared for the first time in historical record toward the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh centuries. They also agree that the monks of the Monastery of Marun adopted the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism), that their abbot, Yuhanna (John) Marun, had become a Monothelite and spread this teaching in the neighboring countries, and that many people from the cities of Hims, Hama, Shayzar, Maʿarrat al-Nuʿman, as well as many Greeks (Byzantines), followed this Marun and became part of his community. This agrees with Tal Mahri who states that, after embracing Monothelitism in the form propagated by the Emperor Heraclius, the monks of the Monastery of Marun accepted the Council of Chalcedon. Furthermore, many people in southern Syria also accepted this council and seized many churches and monasteries which belonged to the Syrian Church.

Even more important is the fact that there is no available evidence that any ancient writer ever associated this monastery with a fifth-century ascetic or claimed knowledge as to when this monastery was founded. Father Henri Lammens, who has exerted considerable effort toward establishing the identity of the Monastery of Marun, failed to identify its founder. As to the location of this monastery, he relies on the same authorities already cited, especially al-Masʿudi, and concludes that the Monastery of Marun was located in Syria Secunda, a short distance north of Hama. However, he is not sure why it was called the Monastery of Marun, which demonstrates how confused the available sources are on this matter.[17]

We may now conclude that, in Syria, toward the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century, there existed more than one monastery bearing the name of Marun. One of these was located in or near Hama and Shayzar. It gained some notoriety when its monks adopted the Monothelitism in the time of the Emperor Heraclius in the early part of the seventh century. The abbot of this monastery was named Yuhanna (John), and he became a Monothelite with many followers in Syria leading to the slow spread of Monothelitism into Lebanon. Those who followed him were called Maronites. Whether this monastery had any connection with the fifth century ascetic Marun is doubtful. It is even more doubtful that it was the most important monastery in Syria or that

it played a prominent role in defending the doctrine of the two natures of Christ united in one person as defined by the Council of Chalcedon. Indeed, it only adopted this doctrine in the early part of the seventh century in the context of the Monothelite formula enforced by the Emperor Heraclius.

5

Maronite Claims and Sixth-Century Epistolary Documents

MARONITES base their claim that since the fifth century they were upholders of the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon on signatures of Alexander and Paul, abbots of the Monastery of Maro (interpreted as the Monastery of the blessed Marun), which are attached to several letters addressed to Emperor Justinian I, others to Menas, patriarch of Constantinople, one to Pope Agapetus and, still another one to the bishops of Syria Secunda.[1] All of these letters are believed to have been written by monks, abbots, deacons, and bishops from Constantinople, Jerusalem, Sinai, Palestine, and Syria Secunda, and they contain accusations against Severus, patriarch of Antioch (d. 538), Peter, bishop of Apamea, Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, and the Syrian ascetic Z'ura. The gist of the accusations is that these men opposed the definition of faith promulgated by the Council of Chalcedon, by reviling the *Tome* of Leo which promoted it. Two of them, Severus and Peter, were further accused of persecuting Chalcedonian monks and other clerics who opposed their authority and planning the murder of 350 monks. As long as the anti-Chalcedonian Emperor Anastasius I (d. 518) was on the throne, the Chalcedonian clergy held their peace, but when Anastasius died and pro-Chalcedonian Justin I ascended the throne, Severus was forced out of office, and the Chalcedonian clergy unleashed their wrath against Severus and his supporters, wanting to destroy all opposition to the faith of Chalcedon. The letters Chalcedonians wrote to vari-

ous synods meeting in Syria and Constantinople in 518 condemning Severus and his associates are acrimonious in nature. They contain a variety of accusations against Severus and other anti-Chalcedonian church leaders. Two of the letters are important in that they accuse Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea of murdering monks. One of these letters was written in 517 by the clergy of Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda (hereafter referred to as the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda); the other was written by monks from Apamea, in Syria Seconda, to their bishops who met in 518 to condemn Severus of Antioch and his associates (hereafter referred to as the letter of the monks to the Synod of 518). Although the letter to the Synod of 518 does not mention the number of monks slain, the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda specifies 350. The circumstances in both letters related to the killing of these monks led some writers to assume that the circumstances in both letters were the same.[2] We shall see later that the discrepancies in both letters reveal that they were not identical.

In their letter addressed to Pope Hormisda in 517, the monks from Syria Secunda accuse Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea of ambushing and mercilessly killing 350 monks and abbots who were traveling on church business to the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite in Syria near Aleppo. They write:

> Your Holiness had doubtless heard who these men are and who have set them against us. They are that Severus and Peter, who though never counted in the ranks of Christians, daily revile the holy synod of Chalcedon and attack our Father Leo with public abuse, trampling underfoot the venerable canons of the holy Fathers and ignoring the Judgment of God by causing bishops to be appointed by imperial decree and forcing us to mock the aforesaid holy synod by inflicting upon us indescribable torments. As a result of such treatment some of our members could not endure the abuse and departed this world and no small number of the group was lost. As we were en route to the abbey [mandra] of my lord Simeon on church business, the aforesaid shameless men, Severus and Peter, attacked us on the road and killed three hundred and fifty of our number and wounded others. Others who managed to take refuge at the holy alter were slain on the spot and the monastery was burned. These same brutal men turned out by night a large number of terrified men and men spared by payment of ransom, while plundering the meager assets of the church. Letters sent to your Holiness through our venerable brothers John and Sergius whom we sent to Constantinople hoping for reprisals against the outrages committed will inform you of the details. These same emissaries the Emperor

> disdained to greet with so much as a word, but he rebuffed them with insults and threats against the authors of the letters. Hence it is that we realize at long last the mischief perpetrated against the Church by these evil men has actually been instigated by the Emperor himself. We, therefore, entreat you, most holy Father, tearfully and prayerfully that you rise up in wrath and righteousness. Hear my voice, and I know them and they will follow me [John 10]. Do not despise us, holy Father, as we are daily torn by beasts. To the certain knowledge of your holy angel, we anathematize in this same entreaty of ours, which is also a bill of information, all those who have been separated and excommunicated from the Apostolic See. We refer to Nestorius who was bishop of Constantinople, Eutyches, Dioscorus, and Peter of Alexandria who is surnamed Balbus [Mongus-stammerer], and Peter of Antioch who was called Fullo [Fuller], and Acacius who was bishop of Constantinople and one of their patriarchs, and all those who support any of these heretics.[3]

Following this lament are the signatures of more than two hundred abbots, monks, priests, and deacons, all preceded by the signature of Alexander, an abbot of the Monastery of Marun, who saw fit to add "I, Alexander, by the grace of God, priest and archimandrite of St. Maro have signed this petition."[4] A letter dated February 10, 518, which Pope Hormisda ostensibly wrote to the faithful of Syria Secunda[5] has misled some writers into believing that it was a response to the above letter.[6] The contents of this letter, however, give no clue that this was the case.

In their letter to the Synod of 518, the monks and abbots of Apamea complained of the "wicked" behavior of Severus of Antioch and his Bishop Peter of Apamea. They write:

> We were on our way to pagum figulorum [the Potters' village], which is close to the temple of the blessed Simon the confessor, and looking forward to peace and union of charity and prayer, surrounding ourselves with the habit and mind appropriate to monks. We do not know how we merited an enemy like this wicked Severus whom Christians never knew nor accepted and with whom they never wished to participate in true communion. And if the opinion of an enemy of truth is respected, Jews and monks invaded us from certain high and rocky places. What could we do, how could we resist the fury of those sent against us? For they killed some, they cast others into captivity, they stripped others naked and others they left ignominiously in ragged clothes according to the opinion of those who witnessed what these people have publicly done.
>
> They [Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea] sent an army of rustic men who, in attacking the aforesaid monastery [presum-

> ably the Monastery of Saint Simon] and destroying part of the wall in the night time, entered and killed some monks and beat very many and destroyed a sizeable portion of the Monastery and amid great shouts they installed horrible trophies directed against piety. But they were finally thrown out.[7]

Further in this lengthy letter Peter is accused of a variety of immoral actions, among which are the bringing of harlots to the Monastery of Dorotheus, the beating of some monks, and the jailing of others.[8]

Both the letter to Pope Hormisda and the letter to the Synod of 518 carry the signature of Alexander, presbyter and abbot of the Monastery of the Blessed Maronis (Marun), followed by seventeen signatures of a great number of monks in the Syriac language, but the list is not appended to the letter.[9]

The similarities of the descriptions of the massacre in the two letters have led some writers (for example, Ernest Honigmann) to assume that it was the same event and for the same reasons written by the same monks.[10] This assumption is valid only if such a massacre in Syria in 517 were a reality. Any criticism applying to the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda should also apply to the letter of the monks to the Synod of 518 because both letters describe similar circumstances. Indeed, the same criticism should apply to all the documents later presented to the council assembled in Constantinople in 536 for the sole purpose of condemning Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, and other anti-Chalcedonian church fathers.

If the same monks who addressed the letter to Pope Hormisda also addressed the letter to the Synod of 518, it is surprising that in the letter to the Synod they did not mention their letter to the pope. Also surprising is that in their letter to the pope the monks state that 350 were massacred, while in their letter to the Synod of 518 they left the number unspecified. Furthermore, in their letter to Pope Hormisda the monks state explicitly that they were ambushed while on their way to pagus figulorum (Potters' village) near the temple of the Blessed Simon the Confessor. Honigmann does not mention this village but states that the incident happened near Kfar Karmin (village of the Vines) twenty kilometers to the south of Qalʿ at Simʿan on the site of the Monastery of Saint Simon.[11] The two villages are obviously not the same. Further, in their letter to Pope Hormisda the complaining monks state that they delegated two venerable brothers, John and Sergius, to Constantinople to present their case to Emperor Anastasius and that the emperor disdained these emissaries, while in their letter to the Synod of 518 they mention nothing about their emissaries or their missions. Moreover, in

their letter of 518 the monks appear to rely on the opinion of witnesses for their account while the impression received from their other letter is that they were on the spot when the attack took place. Here is their account: "How could we resist the fury of those who were sent against us? For they killed some, they threw others into captivity, they stripped others naked and others they left ignominiously in ragged clothes according to the opinion of those who witnessed what these people have publicly done."[12]

This account seems to indicate that the episode related by the monks is based on unidentified witnesses, which casts a shadow of doubt on its veracity. The discrepancies in the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda and the letter of the monks to the Synod of 518 are not a matter of negligence or misinterpretation for we know that Alexander, the presbyter and abbot of the Monastery of Marun, signed both letters. This means that he must have been fully aware of their contents, especially that relating to the unforgettable massacre of his colleagues.

Of these two letters the one from the monks of Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda is more important because it is addressed to a pope whom the monks held in high esteem, considering him the "patriarch of the entire world" and the "holder of the See of Peter." It specifies that 350 monks were slain, and it is the most frequently quoted of all the documents cited by both Maronite and non-Maronite writers in association with Severus of Antioch and his opposition to the definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon. Moreover, this letter to Pope Hormisda is of utmost importance since it not only provides contemporary Maronites with what they claim to be historical evidence to legitimize "Maronite" existence before the seventh century, but it also provides "proof" that the monks of the Monastery of Marun, to whom Maronites trace their origin, were "Catholic" and held the same faith as the Church of Rome. The problem with the letter, however, is that it indicates the faith of these monks in connection with a heinous crime. The monks who signed the letter accused Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea of ambushing and massacring 350 peaceful monks while traveling on church business. Indeed, the whole letter focuses on this massacre, and unless we solve the problem of who the 350 monks were and why they were killed, we will never be able to establish their true faith and identity, and consequently determine whether Maronite claims were justified. The letter implies that the monks were Chalcedonians and that Severus of Antioch killed them because he was the enemy of the Council of Chalcedon. What makes the situation worse is that this so-called butchery has been magnified out of proportion through the Maronite and Roman Catholic

churches' commemoration of the massacre on July 31 of each year, a practice instituted in the eighteenth century. Indeed, not only Maronites consider these men "martyrs," but other writers [for example, Rev. Louis Cheikho, who wrote an article entitled "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ al-Khalqayduni fi al-Tarikh" (The Martyrs of the Council of Chalcedon in History)]. In this article Cheikho cites a statement by Maronite Bishop Germanos Farhat (1670–1732) regarding the incident:

> Today, July 31 is the commemoration of the 350 martyr monks who were massacred by Severus the intruder bishop, follower of Eutyches and Dioscorus in the time of the heretical Emperor Anastasius because they were from the monks of the righteous St. Marun the ascetic, holding the faith of the Holy Council of Chalcedon. This happened in the year 517.[13]

Farhat leaves no room for doubt that the victims were killed by Severus of Antioch for their adherence to the faith of Chalcedon, and that they belonged to the Monastery of Marun, which meant that they were "Maronites." Farhat is incorrect in associating Severus of Antioch and Dioscorus of Alexandria with the heretic Eutyches. These two patriarchs were followers and upholders of the orthodox doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, and not of Eutyches. This doctrine shall be elaborated throughout. The Reverend Henri Lammens is also of the opinion that "these martyrs belonged to the Monastery of St. Marun."[14] Several questions, however, should be clarified before we can make a fair judgment regarding this incident. What was the religious affiliation of these monks? Why, how, and where were they massacred by the agents of Severus of Antioch and his bishop? Since the incident is reported in the form of a letter, how authentic is it and when did writers begin to refer to it?

Elaborating on the massacre, writers from al-Duwayhi to the present maintain that immediately after the Council of Chalcedon (451) all the churches were divided over the admission or rejection of the formula of faith defined by the Council. In Syria, then a province under the rule of the Byzantine emperor in Constantinople, a great majority of the population rejected the Council of Chalcedon. The emperor interfered in the theological dispute in the empire. However, his interference and partisan behavior aggravated rather than alleviated the altercations between the Chalcedonians and their opponents. When Emperor Anastasius I (d. 518) ascended the throne in 491, he favored the staunch anti-Chalcedonian Severus of Antioch because he did not accept the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon. Severus became the patriarch of

Antioch in 512, replacing Flavian II, who vacillated between the Chalcedonians and their opponents. After his elevation to the patriarchal throne, Severus met with some opposition by a few bishops in Syria Secunda, especially in Apamea. According to sixth-century historian Evagrius, opposition mounted against the new patriarch soon after he delivered synodical letters to the bishops under his jurisdiction.[15] As a result, some bishops and priests who held divergent theological views separated themselves from Severus. Of these Evagrius mentions Cosmas, bishop of Evagrius's native town Epiphania, present-day Hama, Severian, bishop of Arethusa, Epiphanius of Tyre, other bishops, and clergy who opposed Severus (for example, Julian, bishop of Bostra, and Peter, bishop of Damascus) were forced to abandon their churches. Moreover, many priests from Apamea also separated themselves from communion with Severus.[16] Following the progress of these events, Evagrius states that upon learning that Cosmas and Severian had sent letters of deposition to Severus, Emperor Anastasius instructed Asiaticus, a commander in Phoenicia, Lebanon, to expel these two bishops from their sees.

When Asiaticus arrived in the East (Syria), he found that the bishops had many supporters, especially in the cities under their jurisdiction, and realized that he could not depose them without bloodshed. Evagrius states that Anastasius was a great humanitarian and that he wrote to Asiaticus that he did not desire the accomplishment of any goal, no matter how important, if one drop of blood were shed.[17] We learn also from Severus's letter to chief physician Theotecnus, that the emperor and the master of the offices had written to him to annul the disposition of those whom the patriarch calls "no-bishops" in Syria Secunda. Severus answers that "since this is your pleasure, if they lawfully repent, the intention of the canons receives them, provided all the bishops who deposed them assemble together and canonically receive them."[18] What Severus is saying in reality is that these disobedient bishops were deposed by a council of bishops, and that according to the rules of the church they could not be restored without a council of bishops. This clearly indicates that Severus did not act arbitrarily or single-handedly in deposing the bishops. Whether the tolerant attitude of the imperial court encouraged the audacity of the intransigent bishops, as Honigmann remarks, is of no consequence.[19] What is important is whether Severus became disappointed and thus lost his senses and consequently set with Peter, bishop of Apamea, an ambush for the monks on their way to the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite. Ernest Honigman, who has described at length the background of tension between Severus and the bishops opposed to him, mentions no violence or murder of any sort. He

relies, as does this study, on the account of Evagrius, which gives no report of violence or bloodshed. What, then, is the source of the alleged massacre of the 350 monks by Severus and Peter of Apamea? Honigmann reveals it when he states:

> The events that followed are known principally from the acts of the Council of Constantinople held under the Patriarch Menas in 536, because among those pieces presented to the Council of 518 only those have been preserved which were cited eighteen years later before it. The authors who compiled these documents in 536 were not careful to establish a clear and rigorous chronology of events. They set forth in random fashion the infamies of Peter [bishop of Apamea]; they contented themselves with simple allusions.
>
> Another document which one can date with some probability to the autumn of 517 is a letter by the archimandarites and monks of Syria Secunda addressed to Pope Hormisda.[20]

Honigmann also states that this incident took place near the village Kfar Karmin, twenty kilometers to the south of Qal'at Sim'an on the site of the Monastery of Saint Simon,[21] while the letter to the Synod of 518 clearly states that the place was the Potters' village. What Honigmann is saying is that the circumstances which led to the massacre of 350 monks are known from two sources, those letters presented to the Synod of bishops from Syria Secunda in 518; and here he has in mind the letter of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda and the opposition of the clergy of Syria Secunda, who were Chalcedonians, to the authority of the anti-Chalcedonian Severus and their refusal to subscribe to his faith.[22]

Another contemporary writer, W. H. C. Frend, also discussed the opposition of the bishops of Syria Secunda to the authority of Severus of Antioch, but unlike Honigmann, he gives the impression that "except for a few isolated though important centers like Apamea, Syria II was united against him."[23] If we understand Evagrius correctly, only a few bishops and priests in Syria Secunda were opposed to the authority of Severus, while the majority of the bishops in Syria stood behind Severus. Like other writers, Frend cites the letter to Hormisda in which the monks of Syria Secunda accuse Severus of killing 350 of their number, but Frend makes no attempt to verify its contents or authenticity.[24]

It is thus evident that the sources on the massacre of these monks are the letter to Pope Hormisda and the letter to the Synod of 518. We have already noted the discrepancies between these letters and have indicated their vulnerability. We may add here that if different groups of

monks wrote the two letters and signed them, it seems very likely that the letters are reporting two different incidents of monks slain at the alleged instigation of Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea, one involving 350 monks, the other an unspecified number of monks. The point is that the whole affair involving the massacre of monks lacks strong historical substantiation.

A question arises here as to the source of the letter of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda. The letter of the monks to the Synod of 518 appears for the first time eighteen years later at the Council of Constantinople in 536, although there is no evidence that the members of this council deliberated on it. We have no evidence whatsoever that the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda was ever presented to the Council of Constantinople in 536 or for that matter to any other synod, even the one assembled in 518 to condemn Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea. The editors of the *Sacrosancta Concilia* (Paris, 1671), Philip Labbe and Gabriel Cossartii, do not include this letter among the documents presented to the Council of Constantinople but rather place it in the section on the life of Pope Hormisda in the fourth volume of the work with a footnote by Severinus Binius, who was the first to edit the manuscript of the acts of the Council of Constantinople discovered in 1618.[25] Binius states that "at this time there happened those things which Anastasius the librarian writes in the life of Hormisda in these words: 'Likewise, for the second time he [Hormisda] sent Ennodius, etc." Binius does not explain what "those things" are, but he continues to say that "once these things happened, Severus of Antioch and other acephali brought murder and injury to the orthodox people as the following letter [of the monks to Pope Hormisda] shows."[26] Binius is not of great help since he does not provide any information about this letter, its origin, or the manuscript in which he found it. Since Binius and the editors of the *Sacrosancta Concilia* do not present evidence to support the existence of the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda, we are left with no alternative but to conclude that this letter is without historical support.

However, the editors of the *Sacrosancta Concilia* include in the acts of the Council of Constantinople (536) a letter addressed by Pope Hormisda to the bishops, abbots, and other clergy of Syria Secunda, with a marginal note indicating that this letter appears as letter No. 21 in an ancient Vatican codex edited in Rome in 1591; they do not identify the codex or its editor.[27] This letter led some writers to believe that it was a response to the letter from the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda,[28] but there is no historical evidence to support such an assump-

tion. We shall see later that this letter of Pope Hormisda has nothing to do with the circumstances contained in the letter which monks from Syria Secunda wrote to the pope.

So far we have shown that the accusations leveled against Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea, specifically the killing of 350 monks, are principally known from the two letters already discussed. While the letter of the clergy from Apamea to the Synod of 518 was resurrected in the Council of Constantinople in 536, eighteen years after it was allegedly written, the letter of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda was presented neither to this council nor to any other preceding council. The first appearance of this letter is in the *Sacrosancta Concilia*, first published in 1671.[29] Moreover, there is no external evidence to support the validity of this letter.

However, the case of the letter to the Synod of 518 is different since it appeared in the acts of the Council of Constantinople in 536 with other documents for the purpose of condemning Severus of Antioch and other anti-Chalcedonian church fathers. It is appropriate to investigate the purpose and nature of this council in order to establish the validity of the accusations against the anti-Chalcedonian fathers and eventually to establish not only the validity of this letter, but also of other letters, especially the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda. Once this has been done it becomes easier to establish the validity of the claims that Maronites base on the signatures of certain abbots appended to these letters.

The council was held in May and June 536, and produced numerous and comprehensive acts. These acts were first edited by Severinus Binius in 1618, after a manuscript, now in the Library of Heidelberg, which according to Charles Joseph Hefele was in many places defective, and in others "erroneous and incoherent."[30] Hefele further states that a much better text was discovered, also in 1618, by the learned Jesuit Fronton le Due, but it too "left a good deal to be gleaned by Labbe, a member of his order. To the industry of the latter we owe the present text."[31]

The source then of the letter comprises two indexes discovered in Europe in 1618. One of them is defective in many places and in some places incoherent. At his own discretion Philip Labbe, a seventeenth-century Jesuit writer, took the other text, gleaning from it what he thought to be appropriate. In brief, the original source of information regarding the massacre—the source on which all writers on the subject have relied—is highly dubious.

We have already shown the vulnerability of the letter submitted to the Synod of 518. This vulnerability will be even more decisive if we place the events of this synod and of the acts of the Council of Constantinople of 536 in their proper historical perspective. To do so it is necessary to investigate briefly the events occurring in the wake of the Council of Chalcedon.

The definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon in 451 was based on the *Tome* of Pope Leo I and it created in the church more dissension, ill will, and disharmony than good will, harmony, and peace. What intensified this dissension is that the Byzantine emperors and state took sides on this highly explosive theological issue. In 482 the Emperor Zeno issued his *Henotikon* (Instrument of Union) in an attempt to reconcile the Chalcedonians with the non-Chalcedonians. Although the *Henotikon* did not expressly condemn the Council of Chalcedon, its whole tenor was directed against the faith defined by that council. Because the *Henotikon* was proposed and published at the behest of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, it created a rift between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. Although some Egyptians were not completely happy with the *Henotikon*, because it did not contain an explicit condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, it was accepted by the majority of those who rejected the formula of faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon as containing the true orthodox faith.[32] In 491 Zeno died and on April 10 of that year Anastasius accended the throne. Anastasius was anti-Chalcedonian and naturally a sympathizer with those church fathers who rejected the Council of Chalcedon.[33] But the fate of the anti-Chalcedonians changed for the worse when in 518 Anastasius was succeeded by Justin I. The new emperor was a Latin and a staunch upholder of the Council of Chalcedon. He was illiterate and most likely had no proper understanding of the complex theological issues of his time.[34] Believing that the unity of the empire depended on the unity of the churches, Justin determined to make the definition of the faith of the Council of Chalcedon the faith of the whole empire. To achieve this end he launched the severest persecution against those who rejected the Council of Chalcedon. One of his victims was Severus, patriarch of Antioch. Threatened with having his tongue cut off, Severus left his see in 518 and went to live in Egypt, there continuing to administer that part of the Church of Antioch which adhered to him until his death in 538.[35]

No sooner was Severus forced out of his see than his enemies, encouraged by a hostile emperor, began to vent their vengeance on him

and his associates with the intention of destroying them and their church. Several synods and councils met in 518 in Syria and Constantinople to condemn the anti-Chalcedonian church fathers, particularly Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, and the ascetic Z'ura. One of these was a local synod held in Tyre on September 16, 518; another synod was held by bishops from Syria Secunda under the presidency of bishop Cyrus of Mariamna in 518.[36] These bishops wrote a letter to John II, the Cappadocian, patriarch of Constantinople, addressing him as the "ecumenical patriarch" and expressing their joy that an "orthodox" emperor was reigning. Also in this letter they declare their support of the council Patriarch John had convened in Constantinople in the same year (518), and they condemn Severus of Antioch and his associates. To their letter to the patriarch the bishops attached another letter which they had received from some bishops from the district of Apamea. In this they accuse Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea of murdering monks but without specifying their number. This is the letter which we have designated as the letter of monks to the Synod of 518.[37] A third council was called by the aforementioned patriarch John the Cappadocian. It met in Constantinople on July 20, 518, and included forty-three or forty-four bishops.[38] It was an important council because it met in the capital and because the synod held in Syria Secunda submitted documents to it which included the letter of bishops from Apamea containing accusation of homicide against Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea. However, it is peculiar that John II, the Cappadocian, patriarch of Constantinople, did not attend this council which he called into being, but did address a letter to it. John was an opportunist. Under Emperor Anastasius he gave the impression to Severus of Antioch that he was, as Severus writes in one of his letter, "inclined toward the right opinions and holds out some pleasing hopes to the orthodox." But he turned out to be a man of unscrupulous character who, in the words of Severus of Antioch, "is more desirous of adopting a deceitful middle course, and of walking himself also according to that model which Timothy his predecessor adopted in his Synodical letters."[39] Whatever the palliatives of Severus of Antioch may have been, he was abhored by the members of the Synod of 518.[40] What makes the intention of this council even more questionable is that it met without John, patriarch of Constantinople, who later was to condemn Severus of Antioch to protect his own position.

Moreover, the acts of the Synod of 518 were not discussed until 536, when a similar council met to condemn the same Severus of Antioch.[41] It seems strange that the documents submitted to the Council of

536, including the letter which the monks from Apamea (including Alexander, who styles himself as the abbot of the Monastery of Marun) addressed to the Synod of bishops which met in Syria Secunda in 518, were only brought to light eighteen years later at the council held in 536. Equally strange is that the heinous crimes attributed to Severus of Antioch escaped the people and clergy during these eighteen years. There is no evidence that a complaint was made by them against Severus of Antioch except for two letters; the one submitted to the Synod of 518; the other submitted to Pope Hormisda and not even known to the council which met in 536. Since the evidence which contemporary Maronites cite dates back to this council, it is necessary to know the circumstances and the proceedings of the council and the evidence presented to it, particularly the letters which the Maronites use to defend their adherence to the Chalcedonian faith.

When Justinian I became emperor in 527, he, like his uncle Justin before him, was concerned with reconciling the Chalcedonians and their opponents to achieve peace and harmony in the empire. Like his uncle, he, too, was a Chalcedonian, but his wife Theodora was anti-Chalcedonian and supported the anti-Chalcedonian church fathers, one of whom was Severus of Antioch. It was Theodora who persuaded the emperor to invite Severus to the capital to discuss the union of the churches.[42] Justinian wrote many letters to him, but Severus declined to travel to Constantinople. In a letter recorded by Zachariah of Mitylene, the aging patriarch implored the emperor to leave him alone, for he had become old and weak and wished to spend the rest of his days in peace. Although the emperor had promised him full immunity from his enemies, Severus saw no point in making the journey to the capital. He was afraid that if he appeared in the capital "many persons may be roused to anger and inflamed by this paltry anxiety, as by a little coal of fire, so as to trouble and annoy even your Mightiness owing to your affection toward me."[43] The emperor insisted that Severus come to the capital and, finally obeying the emperor's entreaties, the aging patriarch did so, arriving sometime in the year 535. He remained at the imperial palace as the emperor's guest until March of 536.[44]

As Severus predicted, no sooner had he arrived in Constantinople than the Chalcedonian bishops began to agitate against him. Instrumental in this agitation was Ephraim of Amida, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch notorious for his severe persecution of the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon.[45] Ephraim had every reason to be alarmed at the development of events in the capital which might seriously threaten his position. Epiphanius, the Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople,

had died and was succeeded by Anthimus, bishop of Trabzon, a pious man of highly virtuous character. Anthimus was won over by the persuasive Severus and openly rejected the Council of Chalcedon, accepting *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* as his faith.[46] In the meantime, Theodosius, a learned, gentle, and pious man, had become the new pope of Alexandria. He, too, was a friend of Severus and maintained the same faith. Ephraim probably feared that this "triangle" of ecclesiastical power (Severus, Anthimus, and Theodosius) might win the emperor to their side, especially with Empress Theodora supporting them and their formula of faith. Alone in the arena, Ephraim looked not for any casual supporter but for a strong one to help bolster his position and prevent any forthcoming disaster to him and to his see. In his predicament he looked to the Church of Rome, which shared his faith of Chalcedon, and he planned to invite Pope Agapetus (535–536) to Constantinople.[47] To execute this plan he delegated Sergius of Reshayna (present day Ras al-Ayn), a learned man of dubious moral character who was a Monophysite, although he sympathized with the Chalcedonians as his emissary to Agapetus. Sergius delivered the letter of Ephraim to Agapetus, but its contents are not known to us. However, it must have contained an explanation of the situation in the capital and an appeal to the pope to hasten to Constantinople and redeem the situation. This is borne out by the immediate response of Agapetus, who arrived in Constantinople in March 536. So far as we can determine from the account of Zachariah of Mitylene, this was the main reason which motivated Agapetus to visit Constantinople. Hefele is of the opinion that Agapetus was delegated to Constantinople by the East Gothic King Theodatus to discuss political affairs with the emperor.[48]

The arrival of Agapetus must have altered the situation drastically, for he probably persuaded an already irresolute emperor to choose between losing the allegiance of the whole Western church or the enemies of the Council of Chalcedon in the East. This was due to the fact that Agapetus spoke the same language (Latin) as the emperor and that he was the chief priest of Italy, which had already been conquered and brought under the control of the emperor.[49] There is no doubt that Agapetus found it easy to sway the emperor to his side. Agapetus, who refused communion with Severus of Antioch and Anthimus, wrongly calling the one adulterer and the other Eutychianist, succeeded in "perverting the love of the king (emperor) towards them and made him hostile to them, causing him to drive them from the city."[50] At the instigation of Agapetus, Justinian deposed Anthimus and in his place appointed Menas, who became patriarch of Constantinople on March 13, 536.[51]

Intoxicated by his victory over his enemies, Agapetus tried to instigate the emperor to arrest Severus of Antioch, Anthimus, and Zʿura, a Syrian ascetic and die-hard anti-Chalcedonian. The emperor, however, had already given immunity to his guests and Agapetus's maneuver ended with his sudden death in March 536.[52] Severus returned to Egypt but exchanged letters regarding the faith with Anthimus and Theodosius until he died on February 8, 538.[53]

6

The Council of Constantinople of A.D. 536 and the Letter of the Monks of Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda

THE DEATH of Pope Agapetus did not change the situation in the capital. The opponents of Severus of Antioch, on whose side stood the emperor, were now determined to condemn him and his associates. At the beginning of May 536, the council assembled in Constantinople by order of the emperor. The council was attended only by the opponents of Severus of Antioch and his supporters, especially Peter, bishop of Apamea, and the ascetic Z'ura. The tribunal was held with the avowed purpose to condemn those Monophysite leaders who rejected the Council of Chalcedon and to impose by imperial power the Chalcedonian faith on them and on their churches. E. W. Brooks has rightfully observed that "for the events of the Patriarchate of Severus of Antioch outside the letters he wrote, we have little evidence beyond the assertion of his enemies produced at the Synod of 536."[1] And if we add to this statement that the texts of the acts of the Council of Constantinople assembled in 536 are defective, incoherent, and in many places erroneous, and that the better test of these acts was left to the discretion of the seventeenth-century Jesuit editor Philip Labbe to glean what he found appropriate, we come to realize the highly suspicious nature of those acts and of the documents presented to this council.[2]

Presented to this council were several documents in the form of letters which Maronites cite to prove that the Monastery of Marun had existed at least since the beginning of the sixth century and that its

monks held the faith of Chalcedon. The most important of these letters is the one previously mentioned, which the abbots and monks of Syria Secunda addressed to the Synod of 518 and which accused Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea of murdering monks presumably from the Monastery of Marun.

A portion of the text of this letter was given earlier with a discussion of the circumstances which led to the alleged killing of monks by Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea. The manner in which the Council of 536 treated this letter should be of utmost importance since the letter contained devastating evidence against Severus of Antioch and one of his bishops. However, the council, which opened its sessions of May 2, 536, neither discussed this letter nor deliberated on it. Had the members of this council deliberated on this letter, they should have at least expressed shock or grief for the slain monks. In fact, there is no evidence that they condemned Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea for causing the massacre of these monks or for attacking the faith of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. From the postscript appended to the letter we learn that Pope Hormisda had already condemned Severus and Peter for "their manifest errors,"[3] but not for killing innocent monks who died for the faith of Chalcedon. Indeed, in this very postscript, bishops from parts of Italy condemned:

> Not only the wicked writings of Severus in which he presumed to condemn blasphemously the definition of the holy Council of Chalcedon and the letters of Leo of happy memory but they include also the chains of the condemnations to bind Z'ura and those in communion with them or remain intractable in their error.[4]

From this postscript we learn that Pope Hormisda and the bishops of parts of Italy were not informed that hundreds of monks in Syria Secunda were massacred at the instigation of Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea. The postscript contains no information other than the fact that Severus was condemned for attacking the Council of Chalcedon and the letters (meaning the *Tome* of Pope Leo) in his writings. The only reference to the killing of monks in Syria in the acts of the Council of Constantinople of 536 is the letter of the monks to the Synod of 518. It is indeed surprising that a document relating such a heinous crime did not receive thorough deliberation by the members of the council.

The other document which Maronites cite to prove their claims is the letter of the monks of Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda. It is important to note that the letter of the monks to the Synod of 518 was included in the acts of the Council of Constantinople in 536, while the

letter to Pope Hormisda was not, even though it contains similar accusations—particularly the killing of monks from Syria Secunda. Was this letter less important than the one to the Synod of 518, or was it a matter of sheer negligence on the part of those responsible for submitting documents to the Council of Constantinople in 536? It should be remembered that both letters were written by monks from Syria Secunda who were presumably the victims of Severus of Antioch's and Peter of Apamea's designs for massacre, and that both letters contained events of similar background and circumstance. It is surprising that the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda was not included in the acts of the Council of Constantinople in 536 despite the fact that it was addressed to the pontiff of the Church of Rome. As the monks state in their letter to him, they held Hormisda in the highest esteem. It should also be remembered that both Maronite and non-Maronite writers have referred to or quoted this letter in order to establish the existence of the Maronite denomination since the sixth century and to inveigh against Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea to show that they were murderers and common criminals. Therefore the credibility of the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda is of great importance not only to the Maronites or the Chalcedonians, but also to those Orthodox Syrians to whom Severus of Antioch is a man of immaculate and saintly character. He is the subject of their pride and the defender of the "true and orthodox faith of St. Cyril of Alexandria."[5] To show how important this letter is to the Maronites, a Maronite writer links it with the letter of the monks to the Synod of 518 to demonstrate that the events and circumstances in both letters are the same and that the clergy who signed both of them were mostly Maronites from Syria Secunda.[6] Much to our surprise, however, this letter was not presented to or discussed by the Council of Constantinople in 536.

It was not until the fifth session held on June 4 that, at the request of the Italian bishops and Roman deacons, two letters of Pope Hormisda were read. One of these letters is dated February 10, 518, and some writers erroneously maintain that it is the pope's reply to the letter allegedly addressed to him by the monks from Syria Secunda.[7] The second letter dated March 26, 521, is addressed to Epiphanius, the new patriarch of Constantinople. It contains instructions on how to treat and reconcile the church which has been "misled" by Severus of Antioch.[8] By order of Patriarch Menas, the secretaries of his church read the acts of the Synod assembled in Syria Secunda in 518 and the documents relating to it. But there is no evidence that the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda was read at this council. This leads us to conclude that there is no other available document to support the authenticity or the validity of

this letter and that we must rely completely on the internal evidence of the text of the monks' letter to Hormisda.

The letter of the monks to Hormisda opens with the following phrase, "To the most holy and reverend Hormisda, patriarch of the entire world."[9] There is no evidence that a pope of Rome has ever assumed or accepted such a title. Before the sixth century popes were either called bishops or archpriests of Rome. In fact, at the Council of Constantinople of 536, Pope Hormisda was referred to as "the apostolic prefect."[10] To attribute to Hormisda the title of "patriarch of the entire world" indicates that either the monks were ignorant of church practices or that someone interpolated this title in order to prove that the pope had supremacy over all Christendom. There is evidence, however, that the title "patriarch" was exclusively used for the patriarch of Antioch, while the title "Pope" was used by the Coptic bishops of Alexandria and later, in the sixth century, by the bishops of Rome. Other bishops—such as the bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem—were only called archbishops.[11] There is also evidence that at the beginning of the sixth century, the patriarch of Constantinople, John II, the Cappadocian (518–520), was addressed as ecumenical or universal patriarch.[12] There is evidence, too, that Pope Leo I objected to this title. According to Popes Gregory the Great and Leo IX, the Council of Chalcedon conferred the title "universal patriarch" on Pope Leo I, but he and his successors refused this unsuitable designation. Although the acts of the Council of Chalcedon and the letters of Pope Leo are silent on this point, there is ample evidence that succeeding popes strongly rejected this appellation.[13] The popes of Rome also objected to the use of the title "universal" by the patriarch of Constantinople and a heated argument over it ensued between the two Sees of Rome and Constantinople.

In 587, a council met in Constantinople under the presidency of John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople, and officially conferred the title "universal" on the patriarchs of Constantinople. Pope Pelagius II of Rome objected that the council met without his knowledge and contested the use of the title "universal" by the patriarchs of Constantinople. Pelagius instructed his deputy in Constantinople not to have communion with John unless he dropped his title. John, of course, refused to do so, and Pelagius contented himself by referring the matter to the Chalcedonian patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. In his letter to John, Pelagius II said that no patriarch had at any time used such a "profane title."[14] His successor, Gregory I (590–604), also objected to the use of his title. Gregory relates that at the council assembled in Constantinople in 587, Patriarch John of Constantinople called himself the "Universal Bishop."[15]

The pope quotes Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch Gregory's declaration in that council: "Let your brotherhood know that in the Council, John of Constantinople was a proud and pestiferous ecumenicum,"[16] that is to say, he usurped for himself the title "universal." In his letter to the same John of Constantinople, Pope Gregory again objects to the title "universal." He states: "Jesus invested St. Peter with all power and he was not called universal apostle. And yet we find this holy man, my co-priest John, trying to call himself the universal bishop. I am impelled to cry out *O tempora o mores*."[17]

These testimonies indicate that no predecessor of Pope Gregory had used such a title, or Gregory himself would not have objected so vehemently to it. The point is that the title, "patriarch of the entire world," was not current or known in 517 when the letter of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda was written, and the appellation might be a later interpolation.[18] The preamble of the letter goes on to describe Hormisda as "the holder of the see of Peter, prince of the Apostles." In the body of the letter the monks appeal to Hormisda to "Rise up, holy Father, and come to rescue us—fix your eyes upon Peter, prince of the Apostles whose See you occupy."[19] At this point, we cannot go into the validity and historicity of the Petrine tradition held by the Church of Rome, but as far as we can ascertain, the tradition of the Church of Antioch indicates that Saint Peter founded the Church of Antioch and was its first bishop.[20] Writing to Alexander, patriarch of Antioch, Pope Innocent I (402–417) states that Saint Peter, the head of the Apostles, was the first to occupy the See of Antioch.[21] There is conclusive evidence that the Church of Rome celebrates the founding of the See of Antioch by Saint Peter every February 22.[22] Furthermore, a late fifth and early sixth-century Syriac manuscript states that Antioch, Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, and even Pontus received the priesthood from Simon Cephas (Saint Peter), who laid the foundation of the church and built a church in Antioch.[23] What is significant to our purpose is that if those monks who wrote and signed the letter addressed to Pope Hormisda were Maronites (that is, from the Monastery of Marun) or if they were monks from Syria Secunda, their claim that Pope Hormisda was the "holder" or the "occupier" of the See of Peter is, then, historically tenuous.[24] The monks who lived in Syria Secunda were canonically under the jurisdiction of the See of Antioch and its patriarch. This patriarch was the highest authority to whom they and thousands of monks in monasteries throughout Syria looked for leadership and guidance. There is no evidence that these monks looked to Rome for leadership.

Perhaps we shall never be able to ferret out the true intentions of these monks. Yet we may deduce from this episode that both the popes of Rome and the Maronite patriarchs claim to be the occupiers of the See of Peter.[25] Moreover, it is unlikely that those monks, or at least some of them, and their abbot were not aware of the controversy which ensued between Rome and Constantinople over the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which granted the See of Constantinople sufficient privileges to place it above the See of Rome. Pope Leo I objected to these privileges. In his letter to Emperor Marcian, dated May 22, 452, he wrote that Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, would not use the privileges to harm heads of other churches. He reminded the emperor that the privileges of the churches, which are "defined by the Canons of the holy Fathers and fixed by the decrees of the venerable Synod of Nicea, must be destroyed by no injustice and altered by no innovations."[26] The pope appealed to the emperor not to confirm "the unrighteous attempts of Anatolius which are dangerous to Christian unity and peace and that thou wholesomely restrain his mischievous desire if he persists in it."[27] One may object that these monks (as the alleged letter to Hormisda betrays) had first delegated two monks called John and Sergius to plead their case to Emperor Anastasius. When the emperor paid no attention to their appeal and even had them expelled, these monks turned to Pope Hormisda for help. In point of fact, the relationship between Emperor Anastasius and Hormisda was very strained, as the letters exchanged between the two reveal. Likewise, the relationship between Constantinople and Rome was strained and did not return to normalcy until the accession of Justin I to the throne in 518. Justin was a Latin and a strong supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, and as such, he determined to make peace with Hormisda.[28]

A contemporary writer places the appeal of the monks from Syria Secunda to Hormisda in an entirely different, but more plausible, context. Peter Charanis, who elaborated on the religious policy of Anastasius, explains that the relations between Severus of Antioch and some of his bishops were tense and that several of them refused to accept his authority. The emperor sided with Severus but at one time refused to use his imperial power to bring the dissenting bishops into line. Anastasius tried to improve his relations with Pope Hormisda and was expecting an embassy from Rome. The peacemaking efforts by the emperor did not change the attitude of Severus toward the dissenting bishops, with the result that many ecclesiastics of Syria Secunda finally turned to Rome and signed the *Libellus* of Hormisda. In this *Libellus* (a confession of

faith), these bishops not only anathematized the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, but also the leaders in the separation of the patriarchate of Constantinople from Rome.[29] This attitude of Severus of Antioch toward the dissenting bishops whom he attempted to bring to obedience through patience and the enforcement of church canons may be unyielding. What is more important is that Charanis, who has thoroughly studied the religious situation under Anastasius, with special attention to the tensions between Severus of Antioch and the monks and bishops of Syria Secunda, never mentions directly or indirectly the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda in which they accuse Severus and Peter of Apamea of killing 350 of their number. Neither does A. A. Vasiliev, who has thoroughly examined this subject, mention this letter or its contents.[30] This seems very strange indeed, and the only explanation of the silence of these writers regarding this letter is that they must have considered it too vulnerable to merit attention. What is even more peculiar is that no writer, particularly Charanis, has ever mentioned that two envoys named John and Sergius were dispatched by the monks of Syria Secunda to Emperor Anastasius to complain against the alleged crimes of Severus of Antioch and his Bishop Peter, or that these envoys were humiliated and expelled by the emperor. It is surprising that such a significant matter be left without any record, official or otherwise, except for this single letter. More surprising is that such an "important" letter escaped the attention of writers from the year 517 to the seventeenth century.

Now we come to the most crucial part of the monks' letter to Hormisda. The monks who signed the letter claimed that while they were en route to the Monastery of Saint Simon (the Stylite) on church business:

> The shameless Severus and Peter attacked us on the road and killed three hundred and fifty of our number and wounded others. Others who managed to take refuge at the holy alter were slain on the spot and the monastery was burned. These same brutal men turned out by night a large number of terrified men and men spared by payment of ransom, while plundering the meager assets of the church.[31]

From the letter of the monks to Hormisda, we learn that Severus and Peter not only were accused of killing 350 monks, but also of wounding others and of burning and destroying the monastery. This letter does not mention this monastery by name, but it must have been the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite. Moreover, many more monks were supposedly slain who had managed to take refuge at the holy altar of that monastery. The monks' letter to the Synod of 518 adds that

Severus and his Bishop Peter employed Jews, laymen, and monks under their jurisdiction to attack them. They killed some, took others as captives, and after stripping them of their clothes paraded them in public. (A large portion of this letter is quoted in the previous chapter and need not be repeated here).

The "crimes" ascribed to Severus of Antioch and his bishop are by no means trivial. Here we are faced with a number of hideous crimes including the massacre of innocent people, plundering of churches, and immoral procurement of common prostitutes for reckless young men from outside the monastery. It seems incredible that these crimes were perpetrated by famous officials of the church like Severus and Peter and yet escaped the attention of the inhabitants and the authorities in Syria or the civil authorities in Constantinople. Equally incredible is that they escaped the attention of the adversaries of Severus of Antioch, including Chalcedonian writers and clergy. It does not seem possible that Severus of Antioch went to Constantinople at the invitation of Emperor Justinian, a resolute upholder of the Council of Chalcedon; yet neither the emperor nor Severus's enemies ever brought up these crimes or confronted him with them, despite the fact that he remained more than a year in Constantinople, leaving only shortly before the council met in that city in 536.[32] Moreover, there is no evidence that Emperor Justinian, who invited Severus to the capital to discuss the unity of the churches, knew that the hands of this aged patriarch were stained with innocent blood. However, there is evidence that the emperor, for purely doctrinal reasons, published on August 6, 536, an edict (his forty-second novel) condemning Severus, Anthimus, Peter of Apamea, and Zʿura and subjecting their supporters to the severest punishment. Furthermore, the emperor ordered the books of Severus of Antioch to be burned by everyone who possessed them. He also ordered that if anyone received Severus, Anthimus, Zʿura, and Peter or their supporters into his house, his house and belongings would be confiscated and turned over to the church.[33] It seems strange that the emperor who pronounced such a severe judgment against Severus and Peter of Apamea neglected to refer to the horrible crimes they supposedly perpetrated.

Another question that comes to mind is how such heinous crimes could escape the attention of the historian Evagrius. Evagrius is of utmost importance to our subject for several reasons. He was a Syrian and a native of Epiphania (present-day Hama in Syria, not far from Apamea), the bishopric seat of Peter. In other words, he was born and raised in Syria Secunda where the monks of Marun lived. In his youth he visited Apamea with his parents to see the display of the wood of the

Holy Cross. He was quite familiar with Antioch and had also visited Constantinople. By profession he was an advocate; doctrinally, he was a Chalcedonian and by no means a sympathizer with Severus of Antioch and those who held his doctrine.[34] In fact, he lived in a period very close to the stage of events in Syria when Severus was the patriarch of Antioch (512–518). He was born in the same year, 536, in which the council held in Constantinople pronounced condemnation of Severus and Peter of Apamea, and ordered the writings of Severus burned. From his history we learn that he began writing it in the year 593, and that there were many people still living in his time who had witnessed the sequence of events in Syria since the time Severus was the patriarch of Antioch. Evagrius states in many places that he received his information as "transmitted to us from our fathers" or "transmitted to us from those who made them a subject of notice."[35] Therefore, there appears to be every reason to believe that Evagrius is a reasonable and conscientious historian.

Evagrius discusses the accession of Severus to the patriarchal throne and the tension which arose as a result of the differences between him and some of the bishops under his jurisdiction over the Council of Chalcedon. According to canonical custom, Severus sent what were then called "synodical" or "enthronistic" letters (similar to a king's coronation speech) to all his bishops, asking them to comply with his doctrine, which was contrary to that of Chalcedon. Evagrius states that some bishops subject to Antioch were forced into compliance like Marinus, bishop of Beirut; others "by force and compulsion concurred in the synodal letters of Severus."[36] He goes on to say that after having concurred by compulsion, other bishops "recalled their assent, among them the bishops subject to Apamea."[37] Others who disagreed with Severus abandoned their churches (for example, Julian of Bostra, and Peter of Damascus).[38] Evagrius uses the words "force and compulsion" as being employed to make some bishops comply with the synodical letters of the patriarch, but he never refers to the use of physical violence or bloodshed. Yet Glanville Downey, who cites Evagrius in this respect, attempts to show that by "force" and "compulsion" Evagrius meant physical violence, although his text seems to imply this by the use of the words—*biai Kai anagkei*. Downey's statement that "there seems to be good reason to believe that Severus and his followers employed physical violence against their opponents,"[39] seems to overstate the case. It is peculiar that Evagrius, who accused Severus of Antioch of using force and compulsion against his opponents, says nothing about the killing of 350 monks by Severus. We have no evidence that those who witnessed this butchery, or at least heard about it from eye witnesses, have transmitted it to their

sons and grandsons. In fact, no church historian, especially Theophanes, who had no sympathy for Severus, ever mentioned this massacre. We never hear about this massacre until late in the seventeenth century, when some writers began to refer to it. Even the erudite Joseph Assemani (1688–1768), a staunch Chalcedonian and Maronite bishop, whom Maronite writer Rashid al-Shartuni describes as "the Sultan of learned men,[40] seems silent on this matter. Furthermore, we cannot overlook the opinion of Roman Catholic writer Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud who describes Severus of Antioch as a "notorious atheist."[41] Only once did Dawud mention the letter of the monks to Hormisda, and then did not refer to the massacre of 350 monks. Indeed, Dawud produces a portion of the letter only to refute it.[42] Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704) was one of the earliest writers to cite this letter to prove that the Monastery of Marun had existed since the fifth century and that its inmates were persecuted because of their defense of the "holy council,"[43] by which he means the Council of Chalcedon. Another early writer to refer to the alleged massacre of these monks is Edward Gibbon (1737–1794). Gibbon states that "the tyrant of Syria, (meaning Severus), forced the belief of his creed, and his reign was polluted with the blood of three hundred and fifty monks, who were slain, not perhaps without provocation or resistance under the walls of Apamea."[44] Gibbon does not reveal his source, but his editor refers us to the letter of the monks of Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda.[45] Certainly he adds no more information to this matter, and it is difficult to accept his statement in regard to this incident. Despite this statement by Gibbon, no writer in the West has critically analyzed or attempted to verify the source and circumstances of this alleged massacre as related in the letter under discussion. Contemporary writers like Ernest Honigmann, Robert C. Crawford, W. H. C. Frend, Francis Dvornik, and others have referred to the letter and the incident but without questioning its veracity.[46]

7

The Maronites and Saint Simon the Stylite

MARONITES maintain that the letter the monks wrote to Pope Hormisda reveals that they were not only Maronites, but also Chalcedonians, who lost 350 of their number because they held the Chalcedonian faith. According to this letter, these monks lost their lives while they were en route to the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite on church business. This indicates that, like them, Saint Simon and, later, the monks of his monastery were Chalcedonians; otherwise, they would have not visited this monastery. This, to be sure, is a complex issue which requires serious investigation and substantiation.

We should admit at the outset that both the Chalcedonians and their opponents claimed Saint Simon the Stylite to be of their doctrinal persuasion. Charles C. Torrey, who published and commented on the letters of Saint Simon, believes that this holy man was a Chalcedonian. He reaches this conclusion by dismissing, for no justifiable reason, the evidence the anti-Chalcedonians produce to prove that Saint Simon had condemned and anathematized the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. The explanation Torrey offers to substantiate his standpoint is untenable.[1]

Torrey is correct in relating that Evagrius, in his writings, produced a letter from Saint Simon to the Byzantine Emperor Leo in which Saint Simon sanctions the Council of Chalcedon. Evagrius states that he had at his disposal the complete text of his letter, but he gave only excerpts of

it because he found it too long to include in his history.[2] The anti-Chalcedonians, however, could also produce a letter from the same Saint Simon to the Emperor Leo, this one condemning the transactions of the Council of Chalcedon. In fact, Torrey himself published the Syriac text of the second letter with English translation,[3] but he was quick to condemn it, as well as two other letters, as "the work of a vehement partisan which were circulated to serve as a Monophysite party weapon."[4] He based his judgment on the superscription to the letter explaining the circumstances under which it was written. According to this superscription Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, went to see Saint Simon to persuade him to endorse the Council of Chalcedon. Saint Simon rejected Theodoret's pleas and wrote a letter to Emperor Leo condemning the Council of Chalcedon.[5] The Syrian historian Michael the Great, patriarch of Antioch, relates the same incident, based on the accounts of earlier historians. He states that, while passing by the abode of Saint Simon, Theodoret visited with him in order to convince him to profess the doctrine of the two natures in Christ. Michael goes on to say that the Chalcedonian partisans spread the rumor that Saint Simon had accepted their doctrine, but adds that Saint Simon refused to accept the transactions of this Council, "as is evident from his letter to the Emperor Leo."[6] Torrey should have realized that the superscription to this letter was written by a copyist, who was an opponent of the Council of Chalcedon, and that the superscription has nothing to do with the letter, which expresses Saint Simon's rejection of the Council of Chalcedon. He had no access, at the time he was writing, to other sources which prove that Saint Simon was not a Chalcedonian. Such evidence is available in Maronite sources.

As mentioned previously, there are two Syriac biographies of Saint Simon the Stylite: one published by Rev. Paul Bedjan and translated into English by Rev. Frederick Lent; and the other, not known in the West, written by Saint Simon's disciple Marqolon. A copy of the latter is at the library of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus.[7] In this biography, Marqolon relates an incident in which Saint Simon praised the holiness of Barsauma, chief of the Syrian ascetics in the East, a staunch supporter of Dioscorus of Alexandria at the Second Council of Ephesus (449), and an arch opponent of the Council of Chalcedon.[8] Marqolon states that the chosen and holy Saint Barsauma desired to visit Jerusalem for the second time and that through divine inspiration Saint Simon foretold this visit. At one time Saint Simon saw a vision that Barsauma was coming to visit him and related this vision to the people in his presence. Later, when Barsauma reached the district of Apamea, Saint

Simon saw another vision and told those present that if anyone desired to obtain the blessing of that righteous man, let him wait for he will be here within three days. Still later, Saint Simon cried with a loud voice, "anyone who desires to receive the blessing of the chosen of God, Barsauma, let him wait until the third hour of the day which is the time of his arrival."[9] At the exact time foreseen, the noble Barsauma arrived at the cell of Saint Simon. When Saint Simon saw him enter the cell, he stretched out his hands and said, "Come in peace servant of the living God. Blessed is your coming. Thanks to Christ who listened to my supplication, a sinner and made me worthy to see you."[10] Then Saint Simon greeted Barsauma joyfully, kissing his forehead and his eyes, while praising God.

To substantiate the authenticity of this episode, we should refer to the tradition and rituals of the Maronite Church, whose writers assert that Saint Simon was Chalcedonian, as well as claiming that 350 of their monks were murdered on account of this council's faith while en route to visit the Monastery of Saint Simon. A Maronite *Fanqith (Prayer Book)* published in Rome, contains an evening prayer usually recited on the festival day of Saint Simon the Stylite as follows: "This is Simon who drove away vain heresies from his flock and exposed their falsehood. This is the one who desired to meet St. Barsauma when he came to see him foretelling his visit three days before his arrival."[11] This quotation agrees with the story related by Marqolon the disciple of Saint Simon. Further evidence that Saint Simon was most likely not a Chalcedonian is that the Maronite Church considers this Barsauma a saint. The calendars of festivals of the Maronite Church, whether in manuscript form or published in Rome since the sixteenth century, designate February 3 as a commemoration day of Saint Barsauma.[12] This is the same day on which the Syrian Orthodox Church commemorates this same saint. Furthermore, Barsauma is also listed among the ascetic saints in the book of liturgies published in Rome in 1594.[13] Evidently, the Maronite Church venerating Barsauma, an arch opponent of the Council of Chalcedon, relates the story of his visit with Saint Simon the Stylite, and suggests that Saint Simon foretold this visit, through divine inspiration three days before it occurred, yet some Maronites maintain that Saint Simon was a Chalcedonian. It is incredible that Saint Simon, if Chalcedonian, offered a magnificent welcome to an avowed enemy of the Council of Chalcedon. The point is that since its inception the Maronite Church has venerated Barsauma and called him a saint, while at the same time Maronites accuse Severus of Antioch of planning the murder of 350 monks from the Monastery of Marun. It should be remembered that Severus and

Barsauma belonged to the same church, professed the same faith, and were staunch opponents of the Council of Chalcedon.

Historical fact indicates that the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite was under the jurisdiction of Severus of Antioch and that he and the Saint Simon monks held the same faith. This is supported by the letter which Severus addressed to the archimandrite of the Monastery of the Holy Lord, Simon, regarding the transgression of canon laws by Bishop Nonnus. Nonnus was reported to have practiced simony (the selling of church offices for money), which prompted his Patriarch Severus to convene a local council to try his case. The patriarch summoned him several times, but Nonnus ignored the summons. Finally, when the patriarch offered him a ten-day grace period, and then doubled it, Nonnus answered through the abbot of the Monastery of Saint Simon, requesting that none of the clerics whom he had ordained through simony be allowed to attend his trial. His attitude must have been construed by the patriarch as disobedience to church authority, for Severus transferred the case to the civil authorities in Antioch. In the meantime, he was hoping to persuade Nonnus to appear before the council of bishops to be tried according to canon law. Severus treated this case with utmost patience and understanding. He even delegated his deacon Eusebius to the Monastery of Saint Simon to urge Nonnus, through the offices of the abbot of the monastery, to hasten to Antioch, because the bishops who assembled in that city could no longer wait and had to return to their parishes.[14]

In essence, there was no need for this communication between Severus and the Abbot of the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite if this monastery were not subject to the authority of Severus and if its abbot did not share his faith. Likewise, there was no need for Severus to prevail upon the abbot, even sending his deacon to the monastery, to send Nonnus to appear before the council of bishops for trial. Furthermore, there is no justification for the lengthy hymn Severus wrote in praise of Saint Simon's virtues. At the end of this hymn, Severus implores the Savior through the prayers of Saint Simon to have mercy upon the believers.[15] Indeed, in recognition of the Monophysite faith of Saint Simon—that is, *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*—the Syrian Church of Antioch, during the time of Severus, added Simon's name to the diptychs and to this day celebrate his memory.[16] A famous father of the Syrian Church, Jacob of Sarug (d. 521), composed a hymn in praise of Saint Simons ascetic life, and as late as the fifteenth century, an erudite Syrian monk and writer, Yeshue of Basibrina (d. 1492), wrote a propitiatory prayer in his commemoration.[17] Dionysius Tal Mahri, patriarchate of

Antioch, relates a very significant early seventh-century incident to support the fact that the Syrian Church of Antioch commemorated and considered Saint Simon one of her saints. He writes that while the believers were celebrating the memory of Saint Simon in his monastery, a band of Arabians attacked them, killing some and plundering the monastery. This event caused many Christians to question the validity of their faith. In their bewilderment, the celebrants asked why such calamity should have befallen them, particularly during the commemoration of Saint Simon.[18] Tal Mahri comments that they did not understand that in earlier times the commemoration of saints, especially of the celebrated Saint Simon, was done in complete spiritual praise, with chanting of hymns and reading of the Holy Scriptures. There were no wanton indulgences such as these people engaged in—eating, drinking, improper dancing, and indecorous behavior—to invoke the wrath of God, who permitted this calamity to happen in order to chastise them.[19] It is true that the Chalcedonian Greek segment of the Church of Antioch also commemorated Saint Simon and counted him among her saints. But it did so because it inherited this tradition from Severus, just as it inherited the tradition of reciting the Nicene Creed from another Patriarch of Antioch, Peter the Fuller (471—488), who, like Severus, was a staunch adherent of Saint Cyril's formula of faith—*One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*—and an opponent of the Council of Chalcedon.[20] It should be remembered that this same formula was endorsed as containing the true faith of the holy fathers of the church by the fifth canon of the Lateran Council assembled in 649 under Pope Martin I. Here is the full text of this canon: "If anyone does not duly profess in accord with the holy fathers and in accord with the truth, one nature incarnate of God the Word, by reason of the fact that our substance is called incarnate, suffering only in the absence of sin, let him be condemned."[21] Such profession leaves no room for doubt that the orthodoxy of the "Monophysitism" of Saint Cyril of Alexandria has been overlooked by the members of the Council of Chalcedon who accused Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria, of harboring the same opinion of Eutyches thus setting a precedent for future Chalcedonians to confuse the "Monophysitism" of Saint Cyril of Alexandria with Eutychianism.

8

Peter the Fuller and the Trisagion Dispute

PERHAPS the most disturbing part of the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda is the section cited above "Chapter V" in connection with Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch, and his association with the Trisagion. In their letter, regarding Peter, the monks said: "To the certain knowledge of your holy angel, we anathematize in this same entreaty of ours, which is also a bill of information, all those who have been separated and excommunicated from the apostolic see. We refer to Nestorius who was bishop of Constantinople and Peter who was called the Fuller."[1] What the monks meant by the apostolic see is that these men whom they anathematized had separated themselves from the See of Rome. Such a claim is not supported by historical evidence. The fundamental point in this context is not the "separation" of these men from the Apostolic See of Rome; it is the case of Peter the Fuller and the addition he presumably made to the Trisagion. Chalcedonians, including the contemporary Maronites, accuse Peter the Fuller of adding to the Trisagion the following phrase: *Thou who wast crucified for us have mercy upon us*. The original text of the Trisagion was as follows: *Holy Thou art God, Holy Thou art Mighty, Holy Thou art Immortal, have mercy upon us.*[2] Whether Peter the Fuller added the former phrase to the Trisagion is not important, although there is strong evidence even in Chalcedonian sources that the Trisagion, with the alleged addition, was used by the Easterners, that is the inhabitants of Syria many years before the time of

Peter the Fuller. We learn from Ephraim of Amida, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (527–545), that the Trisagion, including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*, must have been used in Syria before the time of Peter the Fuller and was addressed to the second person of the Trinity.[3] Ephraim of Amida is correct, for we are informed by Zachariah of Mitylene that the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* was used in Antioch from the time of Eustace (Eutathius), bishop of Antioch (325–330).[4] More than a century later Marinus of Apamea, a confidant and counsellor to the Emperor Anastasius, urged the emperor to institute use of the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* in Constantinople, which means that it was not used by the church in the capital city; according to Zachariah the emperor did so.[5] A Roman Catholic Chaldean writer, Bishop Addai Cher, attributes the use of the Trisagion, including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*, to Rabula, bishop of Edessa (d. 435), a follower of Saint Cyril of Alexandria.[6] Be that as it may, this evidence shows that the Trisagion, including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*, was used by the Church of Antioch from the beginning of the fourth century, almost a hundred and forty years before Peter the Fuller became first patriarch of Antioch in 471. Therefore, it is erroneous to attribute the addition of the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* to the Trisagion to Peter the Fuller. Even more important, Maronites consider this same Peter the Fuller a "heretic," and the phrase added to the Trisagion a "heresy." Al-Duwayhi argues that by his new "heresy," Peter the Fuller had transformed the Trinity into Quaternity. He also states that Peter's intention was to induce the faithful to believe either that Christ suffered in His divinity, or that there were two persons in Christ—one divine and mighty, the other, who suffered crucifixion and death, human and weak. Al-Duwayhi further comments:

> When Peter the Fuller arrived in Hama and the news of his arrival in that city reached the monks of the Monastery of Marun, they unanimously agreed to prevent John [Peter's propagator of the new version of the Trisagion] to enter their district. These monks expelled John and ordered that the Trisagion should be chanted in the morning and evening prayers according to the formula they had received from the early fathers of the church. Also they ordered that the Council of Chalcedon should be held in the same honor as the preceding Councils of Nicea, Constantinople and Ephesus.[7]

Al-Duwayhi leaves no room for doubt that Peter the Fuller not only was a "heretic" but that he attempted to spread his "heretical" version of the Trisagion, including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*, in

the church. It is surprising that in their letter to Pope Hormisda these monks condemned Peter the Fuller as a "heretic" while the whole tradition of the Maronite Church demonstrates that the monks of the Monastery of Marun used the Trisagion in the formula allegedly instituted by Peter the Fuller that is, including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us have mercy upon us.* Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud remarks that either the monks were not the monks of the Monastery of Marun under discussion, or that they were unprincipled men.[8] Dawud goes on to say that these monks belonged to a monastery by the same name but not the one Maronites consider to be their own. Dawud further speculates that these monks of Marun may have been orthodox, meaning Chalcedonians, but in the period following the Fifth Council (553) they became anti-Chalcedonian (that is, Syrian Orthodox "Jacobites") adopting Monothelitism (one will in Christ), thus mixing in their rituals some "Jacobite" as well as Nestorian doctrines. In later generations, according to Dawud, they joined the Church of Rome, although they retained many of their former beliefs. These beliefs, except for the profession of the faith of Chalcedon, are identical with the beliefs of the "Jacobites." To support his view Dawud explains that in his alleged commentary on the faith of the Maronite Church, John Marun uses as one of his authorities "the notorious atheist Severus," meaning the patriarch of Antioch.[9] Dawud attempts to establish that the claim that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Chalcedonians is contradicted by the fact that in doctrinal matters the Maronite Church used as authority the opinions of an enemy of the Council of Chalcedon. However, Dawud is unjustified in describing Severus of Antioch as an "atheist."

Some Maronites offer a different interpretation of the use of the Trisagion in order to establish their adherence to the Church of Rome. Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs admits that in their church books the Maronites have used the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*, but he contends that they have only used it in a "Catholic" connotation—that is, by addressing this phrase to the second person of the Trinity—Christ.[10] He goes on to say that in this form the Trisagion was not used deliberately by the Maronites and that the Roman pontiffs permitted its use if it were intended to be addressed to Christ only. He cites Ephraim of Amida, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, who, in his defense of the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo, states that the Easterners (the people of Syria and Antioch) addressed the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* to Christ alone, which is permissible, while the people of Constantinople rejected the phrase because they believed it to be intended for the whole Trinity. On the basis of this opinion, al-Dibs

concludes that using this phrase in either sense is orthodox.[11] According to Evagrius, many people in Constantinople considered the addition to the Trisagion objectionable because they thought it was addressed to the whole Trinity, which meant that the Godhead had suffered death (Theopaschitism).[12] What is interesting is that al-Dibs cites the authority of anti-Chalcedonian writers (for example, the celebrated Syrian father Jacob of Sarug (d. 521)) to prove that using the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* was orthodox.[13] Like many Chalcedonian writers, al-Dibs erroneously attempts to assign a "heresy" to Peter the Fuller by stating that he used the addition to the Trisagion in a Theopaschite sense.[14] Hefele is incorrect in stating that in order to strengthen the Monophysite (anti-Chalcedonian) party, Peter the Fuller introduced into the Trisagion the words *Thou who wast crucified for us*.[15] We have already demonstrated that the Trisagion was used with this phrase by the Church of Antioch more than a century before Peter the Fuller became patriarch of Antioch in 471. Hefele goes on to explain how this addition to the Trisagion was used in both orthodox and heterodox senses. He states: "*Per communicationem idiomatum* we may say, without objection, 'God was crucified,' but when the idioma 'crucified' is with the invocation *Ter Sanctus* in the Trisagion, then it is implied that, together with the Son, the Father and the Spirit had also suffered upon the cross."[16]

Hefele further complicates his opinion by stating that for the Eutychians an extension of the suffering to the Father and the Holy Spirit "is consistent with their belief that after the union there was but one nature in Christ, the divine."[17] This is not so. Neither Peter the Fuller nor the Syrian Church of Antioch to which he belonged ever held the doctrine of Eutyches. In fact, this church condemns Eutyches as a heretic. Its theology is fundamentally based on the doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, who emphatically maintained that after the union of the two natures of Christ, the very human and the divine, there was but *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. This is opposed to Eutyches's view that although Christ was perfect God and perfect man, His body was not consubstantial (that is, of the same substance) as ours. What Eutyches meant is that the human nature of Christ was transformed into His divine nature with the result that Christ had but one divine nature with the human body serving only as a receptacle for the divine nature.[18] Therefore, it is erroneous to accuse Peter the Fuller of using the addition to the Trisagion with the connotation that the whole Godhead suffered crucifixion and death. The problem is that Hefele and the majority of the Chalcedonians have confused Eutychianism with Saint Cyril's theo-

logical doctrine and have branded both as Monophysitism. The Syrian Church of Antioch has always addressed the Trisagion including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* to Christ, the second person of the Trinity. Writing on the Trisagion, Dionysius Bar Salibi (d. 1171) states:

> That this Trisagion refers to the Son to whom it is appropriate is known by the following: we say "Holy art Thou God the Son," because he became flesh although remaining God; and we say "Holy art Thou Omnipotent," because he put on our weak body although remaining omnipotent in His divinity; and we say "Holy art Thou Immortal," because he died in the flesh although remaining immortal like God.[19]

To corroborate his thesis, Bar Salibi quotes the discourse on the Passover by the great theologian Saint Gregory of Nazianzus (d. 389), who wrote that God became flesh, was crucified, and died.[20]

We may, then, conclude that some monks from Syria Secunda anathematized Peter the Fuller in their letter to Pope Hormisda because of the alleged addition he made to the Trisagion, while they and the rest of the church, with the exception of the inhabitants of Constantinople, have accepted the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*. We shall see later that until late in the sixteenth century the Maronite Church continued to chant the Trisagion with this addition.

9

Signatories to the Letter of the Monks to Pope Hormisda and Related Documents from the Council

As we reach the end of the letter of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda we find that it is appended by a list of signatures, the first being that of Alexander, who styles himself as the Archimandrite (abbot) of Saint Maro (Marun's Monastery).[1] The first thing of note about this list of signatures is that, apart from this Alexander, no signatory is identified by his monastery, a practice out of conformity with church customs and rules at that time.[2] All of these men sign their names as priests, abbots, or deacons without identifying their church, monastery, or parish. Because these men did not sign the letter in accepted official manner, we have no way of knowing who the accusers are. Even the signature of Alexander is subject to question. He does not indicate which Monastery of Marun he represents, and we are left to conjecture whether he was the abbot of the monastery which contemporary Maronites maintain to be the only monastery by this name in Syria Secunda. We have stated previously the admission of the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi that there was more than one Monastery of Marun in Syria, including one near Damascus and another in the Batrun. Indeed, this same patriarch states that there was another Monastery of Marun near Constantinople.[3] What makes the authenticity of these signatures even more suspect is that out of all the signatories only Alexander mentioned the name of his monastery. It is surprising that of all the signatories, only one identified his monastery and that by name

only. More surprising is a letter which contains the most acrimonious and damaging charges against a patriarch of Antioch is not signed properly.

In defense of this document, Rev. Daww claims that there is another letter containing similar charges against Severus. This letter clearly identifies the signatures of the clergy and their respective monasteries. However, the extreme nature of their charges against Severus and Peter creates doubt as to their authenticity.[4] In the letter to the Synod of 518 the monks add more accusations of crimes allegedly committed by Severus and Peter than were related in the monks' letter to Hormisda, although both letters were presumably written approximately at the same time of the year (518). The letter to the Synod of 518 states that the monks were ambushed and attacked near pagus figulorum (the potters' village) near the Monastery of Saint Simon. Their attackers not only massacred many of them but captured the others and paraded them naked in public. They also claim that Peter of Apamea turned the Monastery of Dorotheus and a monastery called "Oregorum" into a brothel and that he perpetrated many other crimes at different times in the home of the "martyr Antonius." He was also accustomed to murdering people for material gain, and after instigating his henchmen to kill men he would proceed to the altar and celebrate the Holy Eucharist with blood-stained hands. The monks add:

> You have also heard in the presence of the governor of the district, the honorable Emilio, and the noble Narses and others all the complaints made by the priests, deacons and archdeacons and the rest of the "Catholic" congregation of the church of Apamea against this Peter, how he spent his life in the company of prostitutes, how he spoke blasphemies against God and the crucified Christ and how he baptized the women who were not worthy of baptism.[5]

This letter is also signed by monks and abbots, the list headed by Alexander, abbot of the Monastery of Marun. Here, as in the case of the letter addressed to Pope Hormisda, one can neither determine which Monastery of Marun this Alexander represented, nor the location or the true identity of other monasteries whose names are appended to the letter. It is strange that this letter contains many crimes allegedly committed by Peter of Apamea not mentioned in the monks' letter to Pope Hormisda, although the circumstances under which both letters were written appear to be similar. From the letter to the Synod of 518 we learn that the crimes attributed to Peter of Apamea were brought to the attention of the governor of the district, the honorable Emilio (which

sounds more Latin than Greek or Syriac), and to Narses through the complaints of the inhabitants of Apamea. However, the monks do not mention whether the governor took action against this "criminal" bishop during the year that had elapsed or even punished him. His accusers went no farther than to appeal to the bishops of Apamea to excommunicate him. In fact, there is no evidence that both civil and ecclesiastical authorities in Syria Secunda were aware of the "crimes" committed by Peter of Apamea. Available sources on this period are greatly inadequate and shed no light on this matter.

More questions arise when one considers Pope Hormisda's response to the monks' letter to him. The pope's answer is so generalized that one cannot determine whether he was addressing a particular group of people or all the clerics and the "orthodox" in Syria Secunda. He writes: "Hormisdas, episcopus, presbyteris, diaconis, et archimandritis secundae Syriae, et reliquis orthodoxis in quocunque Orientali climate degentibus, et in apostolicae sedis communione permanentibus."[6]

It is strange that Pope Hormisda did not address his reply to Alexander, abbot of the Monastery of Marun, whose name headed the list of clerics who signed the letter. Also strange is that his reply contains nothing about the accusation of these monks against Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea. Nor does the pope seem to be concerned about the calamity. He only urges the monks to unite themselves to him and his apostolic see. "After all," he writes, "how could the flock be safe from the wolves if it has gone astray from the only and true shepherd."[7] He exhorts them to hold unto the Council of Chalcedon, avoid the heretics, and reject Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus (of Alexandria), Severus of Antioch, and Peter of Apamea.[8] The generalized form of Hormisda's reply betrays more than a nonchalant attitude toward these "afflicted" clerics; it further betrays a lack of knowledge of the events in the East and portrays him as a selfish and dogmatic person whose main concern was to bring these monks and their monasteries under his jurisdiction. Such a perfunctory answer by the Roman pontiff indicates that he was most unlikely the author of this reply. The content, language, and circumstances of the letter of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda and his reply make it very difficult to accept them as valid documents.

Several other documents of the same tone were presented to the council held in 536 under Menas, patriarch of Constantinople; they contain other allegations of different crimes presumably committed by Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea. Maronite writers cite these documents to prove not only that the Monastery of Marun existed in the

sixth century but that it was the supreme monastery which exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all the monasteries of Syria Secunda. When the council opened on May 2, 536, the priest Marinianus or Marianus, abbot of the Dalmatian monastery and exarch of all the monasteries of Constantinople, together with the monks from Antioch and Jerusalem, presented a petition to the Emperor Justinian, who ordered that it be read at the council. They also requested an audience before the council to state their case. Their request was subsequently granted by Menas.[9] In this document the petitioners referred to Anthimus, Severus of Antioch, Peter of Apamea, and the Syrian ascetic Z'ura as "heretics" who stirred up discussion, pronounced anathemas on the saints, erected profane altars in Constantinople, and stained the earth with the blood of saints.[10] The petition was not signed by all of the complainants but only by representatives of four delegations: two representing the monasteries of Jerusalem and Palestine, the third representing the monasteries of Sinai and Arabia, and fourth, a deacon named Paul, representing the Monastery of Marun and all the monasteries in Syria Secunda. The signature of this Paul appears at the end of the petition in this manner:

> Paul by the grace of God, deacon and delegate of the Monastery of the blessed Marun, chief [exarchos] of all the monasteries of Syria Secunda sent by all the abbots and monks of said districts to your piety carrying their petition against the aforementioned heretical acephali and acting on behalf of all the said abbots and monks, I have signed.[11]

Several questions arise as we contemplate this petition. Paul, the representative of the Monastery of Marun, is only a deacon, and his rank is the lowest of all the clerical offices in the church. It was not the practice in the church for a lowly deacon to represent a number of monasteries or monks, let alone all the monasteries and all the thousands of monks of Syria Secunda. It would be in conformity with canon laws and church customs for a bishop or an abbot to represent his monastery at a council, accompanied by a deacon to serve him. There is a tradition indicating that Jacob of Nisibin took with him to the Council of Nicea (325) his celebrated deacon Ephraim, the Syrian (d. 373). But for a deacon to represent all the monasteries of Syria Secunda in Constantinople is most unlikely.

Commenting on the signature of this Deacon Paul, Maronite Rev. Daww asserts that it is evident from the signature of Paul that the Monastery of Marun had "an actual and judicial authority over all the monasteries of Syria Secunda."[12] For this reason he concludes that the

Monastery of Marun was located in Syria Secunda. We have already pointed out that it has never been the custom in the church for a mere deacon to represent a single monastery at any council. Furthermore, Daww's assertion that the Monastery of Marun had "actual and judicial authority over all the monasteries in Syria Secunda" is without historical foundation; it runs contrary to Evagrius's account that only a few bishops in all of Syria, including Syria Secunda, were opposed to the authority of Severus of Antioch. This indicates that the majority of the bishops in Syria were with their Patriarch Severus.[13] After all, despite some opposition, Severus was elected a patriarch of Antioch by a council of bishops held in Sidon in 512.[14] The majority of bishops in Phoenicia, Lebania, Arabia, Euphratesia, Mesopotamia, and Syria stood solidly behind him and his doctrine.[15] The claim that the Monastery of Marun was supreme among the monasteries of Syria Secunda is substantially weakened by the fact that history is completely silent on the "supremacy" of this monastery, except for the highly questionable letters which Maronites cite to prove such supremacy. Father Henri Lammens also states that the leadership of the Monastery of Marun extended over all of the monasteries of Syria Secunda, but he fails to produce conclusive evidence to support his claim. He adds that it is very difficult to demonstrate the extent of this leadership:

> We do not know whether this leadership was completely honorary or that the Monastery of Marun had some authority over other monasteries. It is also difficult to explain the origin of this leadership, whether it was caused by the separation of one monastery from another or it was caused by the will of the one who founded the monastery, or by the separation of a group of monks from the biggest monastery. All of these questions are very complex and it is not easy to find a solution for them.[16]

We may conclude that this alleged leadership by the Monastery of Marun over all the monasteries of Syria Secunda is groundless and that the opinions presented in support of such supremacy are sheer speculation.

The second document presented at the Council of 536 and used by Maronites to prove their claim is the letter (mentioned in Chapter 5) of the monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Agapetus. This letter was written after the deposition of Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, who united himself with Severus of Antioch while Severus was in the capital. The monks who signed the letter addressed Agapetus as the archpriest of Old Rome and "the Ecumenical Patriarch," just as the other monks from

Syria Secunda called Hormisda "the Patriarch of the entire world."[17] Once more these monks level the same charges against the anti-Chalcedonian leaders, particularly Severus of Antioch. One of these charges is that some anti-Chalcedonians went to a home where Chalcedonian monks lived and in their fury knocked out an eye from a likeness of the Emperor Justinian. One of these anti-Chalcedonians, Isaac the Persian, hit with a stick the head of the likeness of "our orthodox" emperor and insulted his likeness. When the stick broke, Isaac tore the linen from the painting and threw it into the fire. The monks add that these "heretics" also sneaked into the houses of prominent people and led women astray. They set up false altars and baptistries in the suburbs with the protection of powerful figures from the emperor's own court (they mean the Empress Theodora). The monks praise Pope Agapetus and tell him that God has sent him to expel these "heretics" who have disturbed the earth and stained it with the blood of saints. They close their letter to Agapetus by appealing to him to prevail on the emperor to throw the Syrian ascetic Z'ura into the fire in the same manner he ordered the books written by Severus of Antioch to be thrown into fire. The letter is appended by many signatures, including one by a certain Paul, who signs as a monk and representative of the Monastery of the Blessed Marun in Syria Secunda.[18]

Here, as in the case of the letters to Hormisda and the Synod of 518, it is very difficult to accept the historical validity of these charges against Severus of Antioch and against other dignitaries supporting him and his doctrine. As for the "Paul" who signed this letter, one cannot determine whether he was the same Paul who signed the first letter to the Council of 536 (mentioned above) or someone else. It is also difficult to ascertain from his signature if he was only a monk, an ordained priest, or an abbot. He was probably a deacon wearing a monk's habit, a church practice until modern times in some Eastern churches. On this account he may have been the same deacon Paul who signed the aforementioned petition. Again, we are not sure what Monastery of Marun this monk represented. As has been mentioned earlier there was more than one monastery bearing the name of Marun: for example, the letter under discussion contains the signature of a certain Theodorus, abbot of the Monastery of Marun in the district of Sokas in Constantinople.[19]

Finally, Rev. Daww invokes a third document to support Maronite claims. He refers to a memorial which the monks of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Syria, and Palestine submitted to the Patriarch Menas at the end of the fifth session of the council on May 15, 536.[20] It should be remembered that these same monks had submitted a similar memorial to

the Emperor Justinian, as already mentioned. [21] In this memorial to Menas the monks express their pleasure that Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, was condemned, but remark that Satan has still two more assistants—Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea—to fulfill his objectives. They add that these two men have disturbed the peace of the churches, shed the blood of saints, and anathematized the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. They particularly accuse Severus of usurping the See of Antioch, and Peter of usurping the bishopric of Apamea. They allege that Severus later claimed that he had accepted the See of Antioch. These monks also accuse Severus of having served demons in Beirut and even at the time of the Council of 536 of not being free from heathenism. In addition, they also state that Severus, to clear his bad reputation, pretended to correct his Satanic thoughts by accepting baptism in Tripoli. The monks do not stop at this point but also ascribe to Severus and Peter the perpetration of atrocities. They accuse Severus of cutting off the fingers of saints who held onto the church altar seeking sanctuary from the assailants, of arresting and throwing innocent people into prison, and of constantly attacking and plundering many monasteries. They allege that soon after he and his followers were deposed and ex-communicated, Severus escaped punishment by fleeing but later returned to lay waste the city of Constantinople.[22] There is no evidence to support this action of Severus, and no church historian ever mentioned such an incident. Even if we were to understand this accusation figuratively—that Severus laid waste to Constantinople through his theological teaching and his antagonism to the faith of Chalcedon as upheld by the emperors (especially Justin and Justinian)—there is still no evidence that Severus fomented a religious revolt in the capital, laying waste to the religious and church life in that city. We know that Severus visited the capital several times to discuss church unity with the emperor, but it has never been reported that he laid waste to the city of Constantinople, either physically or spiritually. He and his Bishop Peter are also accused of calling illegal meetings and performing baptisms after they were deposed in that city. They reputedly led many people astray and even seduced women. Finally, Severus and Peter supposedly sent a band of "criminal Jews" and thieves who attacked like rabid dogs and killed 350 monks by the sword, cutting the bodies into pieces and never bothering to bury them.[23] Like the previous letter, this memorial is signed by a certain monk named Paul representing the Monastery of the Blessed Marun, "the leading monastery in Syria Secunda."[24]

10

The Maronites and the Letters of the Monks from Syria Secunda

In the preceding chapter we have elaborated on the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda as well as similar documents submitted by these monks to the council held in Constantinople in 536 that contain different accusations against Severus of Antioch and his bishop, Peter of Apamea. It might be useful to recapitulate the main points in these letters, particularly since they are cited by the Maronites as evidence to support their assertion that the Monastery of Marun had been in existence since the fifth century, and that its monks were adherents to the faith of Chalcedon, the faith of the Church of Rome. Thus the Maronites claim that they have been one with the Church of Rome since the fifth century.

The assertions of the Maronites are based solely on a few dubious signatures appended to highly questionable letters. These signatures of monks calling themselves representatives of the Monastery of Marun in Syria Secunda are far from being a decisive substantiation of the claim that they were from the same monastery believed to be the "only" monastery of Marun. Almost all of these letters were presented by disgruntled monks to the council assembled in Constantinople in 536. The pejorative contents of these letters, particularly the accusations they contain against Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea, cast a dark shadow of doubt on their credibility. What convinces us that these are not trustworthy is the fact that there is no evidence beyond these letters to prove that

Severus, patriarch of Antioch, or his bishop, Peter, have ever perpetrated such horrid crimes. Severus and Peter were portrayed as mass murderers, blood-thirsty persecutors of innocent people, highway robbers, churchp plunderers, seducers of women, pimps, worshippers of Satan, and heathens.

Apart from the writings of the enemies of Severus and his supporters in the documents discussed above, all available information regarding this patriarch represents him as a great divine, saintly ascetic and a first-rate theologian of immaculate moral character. Because of his antagonism to the Council of Chalcedon and his renunciation of its definition of faith, Chalcedonian writers until recently have ignored him or belittled his theological contribution. The Emperor Justinian I accused him of having sometimes defended the Nestorians and sometimes the Eutychians; the truth is that Severus contended vehemently against these heretics.[1] W. K. Prentice not only relates that Severus was responsible for the murder of 350 monks but also wrongly accuses him of having been driven from more than one monastery for his "dissolute habits or his heterodox views, or for both."[2] Others who have studied his life and theological concepts and writings recognize his excellence and achievement. Gustave Bardy may not agree with the cause which Severus of Antioch defended but states that his activity recalls in some ways that of Athanasius. He calls Severus a "fighter," the "unconquerable patriarch," and "a gifted man and one of the strongest characters of a period saddened by many instances of failure and cowardice."[3] W. H. C. Frend, who has cited the massacre of 350 monks without verifying its authenticity, describes Severus as "one of the great figures of religious history of the eastern Mediterranean."[4] He has more to say about Severus's Biblical scholarship and ascetic life: "He [Severus] was a Biblical scholar in the mould of Origen and Basil, and like them he was both ascetic and reformer. His theological teaching was simply a vehicle by which he could lead his people towards God by example of ascetic contemplation."[5]

Nor does the historical evidence lead us to accept the supremacy of the Monastery of Marun over all the monasteries of Syria Secunda. Furthermore, there is no historical evidence that the monks of this monastery were defenders of the faith of the Council of Chalcedon; no ancient church historian has related or supported such a claim. It seems strange that history tells us a great deal about the Monastery of Saint Basus near Apamea in Syria Secunda, which claimed to have accommodated at one time more than six thousand monks, and yet kept silent on the Monastery of Marun in the same district until the first half of the seventh

century.[6] Furthermore, it does not seem possible that the monks of these two monasteries, though separated by their acceptance or rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, leave no trace of the slightest communication, whether good or bad, with each other. There is no evidence that the monks of Saint Basus who were under the jurisdiction of Severus of Antioch entered into personal or theological argument with the monks of the nearby Monastery of Marun who were hostile to Severus. This is certainly unusual, if we take into account the highly emotional spirit of the times, which were aggravated by doctrinal disputes and religious intolerance and where Christian dogma was the major issue dividing the allegiance of the Christians to both church and state.

Another point requiring elucidation is whether all of the 350 monks allegedly ambushed and killed at the instigation of Severus of Antioch and Peter of Apamea were from the Monastery of Marun. Maronites believe they were,[7] and for this reason the Maronite Church commemorates them on July 31 of each year as "martyrs" and as disciples of the ascetic Marun.[8]

There is no evidence that all of these monks belonged to the Monastery of Marun. The letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda already discussed indicates that the majority of the monks came from all over Syria Secunda and not from one monastery such as the Monastery of Marun. Indeed, many of them sign as archimandrites (abbots) of monasteries, indicating that they came from different monasteries in Syria, although they do not identify these monasteries. Based on the letter of the monks to Pope Hormisda, Rev. Louis Cheikho lists the names of no less than 25 monasteries to which some of the 350 allegedly slain monks belonged.[9] The letter of the monks to Hormisda and the list of names appended to it, as they appear in Mansi's *Collectio* which Cheikho quotes, contain no names of abbots of monasteries except the name of Alexander, abbot of the monastery of Saint Maro or Marun.[10] However, Cheikho makes it clear that these monks were from different monasteries in Apamea and the valley of al-Asi River.[11] In fact, the Calendar of Festivals of the Church of Rome for July 31 does not indicate that the slain monks were from the Monastery of Marun.[12] Moreover, there is no evidence that the Maronite Church ever commemorated these "martyrs" before the year 1744. Even the Maronite council assembled in Lebanon in 1736, which among other matters instituted the festivals and commemoration days for Maronite saints, did not list a commemoration day for these "martyrs." The Reverend Louis Cheikho states that on August 12, 1744, Pope Benedict XIV issued indulgences for all the Church of Rome, including the Uniate Maronite Church, to commemorate these

monks, and that "perhaps since that date the Maronite Church began to commemorate these "martyrs."[13]

One piece of evidence some writers produce to prove that the Monastery of Marun existed in the fifth century and that its monks were defenders of the faith of Chalcedon is a letter addressed by the monks of this monastery to a group of Syrian Orthodox or anti-Chalcedonian monks in Antioch and the response to it. This letter and response were not unknown to scholars. William Wright, in the second volume of his monumental catalogue, produces excerpts of both letters from a Syriac MS add. 12, 155.[14] According to Wright this manuscript dates back to the eighth century and from its title, "A Volume of Demonstration from the Holy Fathers against Various Heresies," we may deduce that it is a Monophysite (anti-Chalcedonian) compilation whose purpose was to refute the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures of Christ united in one person yet remaining distinct after their union.[15] The Reverend François Nau published these letters in 1903 with French translation and comments.[16] He also provided copies of these letters to the Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs who translated them from Syriac into Arabic and published them in his book *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal*.[17]

The letters under discussion do not clearly state the reasons and the circumstances which prompted their writings. The preamble of the letter of the monks of Marun, "Five propositions sent by the monks of Maro, at Armanaz near Apamea, in a letter, by the hands of Isaac and Sergius, to the monks who took the side of Peter," must have enticed Nau to speculate that these letters were connected with a doctrinal dispute in the time of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Peter III, of Callinicus (581–591).[18] If we turn to Dionysius Tal Mahri's history, we find a clue to the circumstances during the patriarchate of Peter which may shed some light on these letters. According to Tal Mahri there appeared in Alexandria in the time of Damian, patriarch of Alexandria (570–605?), one Istefan (Stephen Niobes) who taught that, "If we confess one nature in the Lord Christ it would no more be possible to say that the difference between the properties of the two natures still exist."[19] What Istefan intended to say is that in the Incarnation the two natures of Christ were so united with each other that the properties of both of them could no more be distinguished from each other. In other words, one of these natures, most likely the divine, must have absorbed the other nature. To both the Church of Alexandria and the Syrian Church of Antioch this teaching was heretical. Damian censured Istefan and warned him to desist from this teaching, but he would not do so. It happened at this time that Patriarch Peter visited Egypt because Paul the Black, a

patriarch of Alexandria deposed in 581, was creating trouble for both the Syrian and Egyptian churches. In Peter's company were two Syrian learned men, Yuhanna (John) Barbour and Probus. When these two men met with Istefan and listened to his theological opinions, they were swayed toward him and his teaching. Both men desired to become bishops, but the patriarch would not satisfy their wishes because of their inclination toward Istefan's heretical teaching. When Patriarch Peter returned to Syria, Yuhanna and Probus remained in Egypt and openly professed Istefan's heresy. Damian expelled them from Egypt, and they went to Syria to spread their beliefs. At a church council held in the Outer Gubba Monastery Peter excommunicated both Yuhanna and Probus, who then contacted Anastasius, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, joined his party, and became Chalcedonians.

When Patriarch Peter died in 591, Yuhanna and Probus asked Anastasius to invite the anti-Chalcedonian Syrian monks to a meeting in Antioch to discuss the new teaching because Yuhanna and Probus accused the late Patriarch Peter of having erred in matters concerning the faith. The Patriarch Peter had already written a treatise refuting, among other things, the teaching of Istefan and his followers Yuhanna Barbour and Probus. The Syrian monks met with Yuhanna and Probus and successfully debated with them matters of the faith. Tal Mahri does not mention how long the debate lasted, nor does he inform us of what became of Yuhanna Barbour and Probus. He does state that after Probus's death his followers returned to the true faith.[20] Perhaps the name of Patriarch Peter in the preamble to the letter of the monks of the Monastery of Marun at Armanaz to a group of anti-Chalcedonian Monophysite Syrian monks in Antioch prompted Rev. Nau to speculate that the letter of the monks was the one which was addressed by Anastasius to the Syrian monks in Antioch. We should recognize in this context two different letters—one from the monks of the Monastery of Marun at Armanaz to a group of anti-Chalcedonian Syrian monks in Antioch and the response to it; and the other from Anastasius, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, inviting a group of anti-Chalcedonian Syrian monks in Antioch to a debate—and that the circumstances under which they were written were different too.

The letter of the monks of Marun does not designate the location of their monastery but the reply of their opponents, written by a monk named Theodore, states that these monks of Marun came from the village of Armanaz in the district of Apamea. This, to be sure, is the first mention of a Monastery of Marun in an identified village called Armanaz, and there is no evidence that this monastery is the same Mon-

astery of Marun located on the Orontes River somewhere between Hama and Apamea. It was noted earlier that the Maronites themselves disagree on the location of the Monastery of Marun. Some writers—Tchalenko, for example—are of the opinion that this monastery was probably in the same place known today as al-Duwayr, five kilometers to the southeast of Armanaz. This indicates that it is not the same monastery the Maronites claim to be theirs. The Reverend Daww quotes Tchalenko but fails to identify this monastery in Armanaz with the Monastery of Marun in Apamea.[21] It is hard to believe that the faith of monks of a monastery considered by Maronites as "chief among all the monasteries in Syria Secunda," was established on the strength of a single dubious correspondence.[22] It is incredible that no church historian, Syrian or otherwise, has ever mentioned this particular correspondence. If such correspondence ever took place, it should logically have done so in the eighth century when, as Monothelites, the monks of the Monastery of Marun entered into heated theological argument with other religious groups in Syria (for example, the Chalcedonian Malkites) to defend their belief in one will of Christ (Monothelitism).[23] They entered into the same argument with the Syrian orthodox (Monophysites) to defend their adherence to the faith of Chalcedon as the correspondence shows. The Maronite priest Bernard G. al-Ghaziri has correctly treated the correspondence under discussion between the monks of the Monastery of Marun in Armanaz and Syrian monks in Antioch as belonging to the eighth century.[24]

II

Were the Monks of the Monastery of Marun Chalcedonians?

THE DEFINITION of the faith by the Council of Chalcedon (451), maintaining that in the Incarnation the two natures of Christ were united in one person yet were separate and distinct after their union, was rejected by a great majority of the churches in Egypt and Syria. Eventually it caused a deep rift within the church which was further aggravated by the interference of the Byzantine emperors in the theological dispute who took sides with the Chalcedonians or their opponents. What began as a disagreement on the definition of the faith and doctrine through sober communication and epistolary exchange was sadly transformed into sheer altercation, vilification, and utter persecution. Those who rejected the definition of the faith of Chalcedon maintained that this definition was an innovation violating the decisions of the Council of Ephesus (431) which, in its sixth session held on July 22, resolved that those who affirm a faith other than the one instituted by the Council of Nicea 325 would be under pain of excommunication and deposition.[1] The opponents of the Council of Chalcedon also maintained that in the Incarnation the Word of God (Logos) was made flesh and that after the union of the two natures of Christ one can no more consider them still to be two separate natures but *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*, in conformity with the Christology of Saint Cyril of Alexandria.[2]

Those who accepted the definition of faith by Chalcedon were labeled by their opponents "Diphysites" and these in turn labeled those

who rejected the faith of this council "Monophysites." Both of these terms are inadequate and do not accurately convey the doctrinal belief for which the two groups stood. We prefer to refer to these groups as Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians. The anti-Chalcedonians gave their opponents the name "Malkites" (from the Syriac Malko, meaning "King"), indicating that they were the followers of the Emperor Marcian, who approved of and promoted the Council of Chalcedon and its novel definition of faith. The Chalcedonians in turn called their opponents "Severians" after Severus, patriarch of Antioch; "Acephali" (meaning headless); and finally "Jacobites" after Jacob Baradaeus (d. 578). Thus the church of Syria was split into two hostile camps, the Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian. And it is no exaggeration or misrepresentation of facts that after 451 there was no group of clergy or laity in Syria with the exception of the few Nestorians who were living in that country, which did not identify with either the Chalcedonians or their opponents. Neutrality or nonalignment in doctrinal matters was not known. Once this state of affairs is placed into its proper historical perspective it becomes easier to identify and determine the doctrinal, as well as the denominational, affiliation of the monks of the Monastery of Marun.

We may then ask what was the religious affiliation of these monks of the Monastery of Marun? Maronite and other writers such as Rev. Nau affirm that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Chalcedonians and defenders of the faith of Chalcedon. The only evidence they produce is several letters, particularly those presented to the council held in Constantinople in 536; furthermore, the letters which Rev. Nau produced do not alter the situation or refute the fact that these monks were not Chalcedonians. According to church canons if they were Chalcedonians, or Malkites, they should have been under the jurisdiction of the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, who, at the time of the disputation between the monks of Marun and the Syrian monks in Antioch, was probably Anastasius I, the Sinaite (593–698). But there is no evidence that the monks of Marun were ever under the authority of a Chalcedonian or Malkite patriarch of Antioch. Indeed, the letter signed by Alexander, abbot of the Monastery of Marun, in 518, was not addressed to the Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch but to Pope Hormisda. The Reverend Simeon Vailhé's attempt to prove that these monks of Marun were "Malkites, i.e. imperialists . . . who represented in Syria the foreign element or the party of strangers, that is to say, the Greeks detested by the Jacobites," is not historical.[3] The monks of the Monastery of Marun were not Greeks but Syrians. They represented no group of strangers who were Greeks. They were natives of Syria who spoke the Syriac lan-

guage, using it also in their daily prayers. Because some of them signed a letter in Greek does not make them Greek, as Vailhé has erroneously maintained. In fact, we find no communication, not even a single letter, between these monks and the Malkite patriarch of Antioch from the middle of the fifth to the end of the sixth centuries. Furthermore, we find no letter written by any of the patriarchs during this period commending the monks of the Monastery of Marun for their defense of the faith of Chalcedon. It is inconceivable that these patriarchs have overlooked a "great monastery" like the Monastery of Marun, which housed more than eight thousand monks and was right in the busy district of Apamea only a few hundred miles away from Antioch. Also inconceivable is that such a "great monastery," which Maronites believe to be the "leader" of all the monasteries in Syria Secunda, existed in such religious oblivion that we hear nothing about its intellectual activity—no scholar, writer, poet, or learned man—at a time when the monasteries of Syria like Talʿada, Qinnesrin, Senun, and al-Muʿallaq in north Mesopotamia boasted many scholars and distinguished learned men. If we turn to the activities of the anti-Chalcedonian Syrian monks, we find that there have always existed between them and their patriarchs a strong relationship concerning matters of the faith or observation of canon law. Thus we find such fathers of the Church of Antioch as Severus, Jacob of Sarug, Philoxenus of Mabug, Jacob of Edessa, and many others addressing letters to such monasteries as Talʿada, Senun and Romanus, and particularly, to the Monastery of Mar Basus of Syria Secunda, not too far from the Monastery of Marun and its patriarchate. But we find no evidence that the monks of the Monastery of Marun have defended the Council of Chalcedon except through one or two dubious letters. In fact, we have evidence that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were persecuted by Chalcedonians. In 745 the Chalcedonian or Malkite patriarch of Antioch, Theophilact Ibn Qanbara of Harran, took a contingent of soldiers all the way to the Monastery of Marun to persecute its monks.[4] There must be a reason for this persecution, and Dionysius Tal Mahri provides the answer. He states that Ibn Qanbara tried to force the monks of the Monastery of Marun to accept the doctrine of two wills in Christ (Dithelitism) and to desist from reciting the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*.[5] Here we have clear evidence that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Monothelites professing one will in Christ and that, unlike the Church of Rome and other Chalcedonian churches, they recited the Trisagion with the phrase used only by the anti-Chalcedonian churches. In other words, the profession of these monks of the faith of Chalcedon meant nothing to a Chalcedonian patri-

arch who persecuted them because he must have considered them Monothelite heretics. Furthermore, the defense of these monks of the faith of Chalcedon led to no firm and lasting relationship between their monastery and other Chalcedonian churches, particularly the Church of Rome. There is no historical evidence to support any such relationship before the thirteenth century. It is peculiar that these monks, who allegedly defended the faith of Chalcedon, were considered by the majority of Chalcedonian writers as heretics.[6] We shall see later that until late in the sixteenth century the Church of Rome remained highly suspicious of the faith of the Maronites and sent several missions to Lebanon to investigate that faith. Even the letter these monks submitted to the Council of Constantinople assembled in 536 did not save them from being branded as heretics. In fact, the Maronite monks kept using the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* long after that council met, despite the fact that the patriarch of Antioch, Peter the Fuller, after being accused of adding this phrase to the Trisagion, was condemned by the council as a "heretic." We may then conclude that the letter of the monks of the Monastery of Marun to the anti-Chalcedonian monks in Antioch was of no significance; it did not absolve them from "heresy," enhance their position in the eyes of Chalcedonian churches such as with the Church of Rome, or create a better relationship with these churches. Furthermore, it is difficult to determine with precision the exact date of the debate between the two groups of monks. We have it on the authority of William Wright that the manuscript which contained this letter of the monks of Marun and the response to it date back to the eighth century, convincing us that the debate must have occurred sometime in the first half of the eighth century when the monks of Marun were debating doctrines with other Christian groups. But what is more important is that the debate, if in fact there was one, was between the monks of the Monastery of Marun in Armanaz and the Syrian monks in Antioch, and that this monastery in Armanaz is not the Monastery of Marun in Apamea, which contemporary Maronites claim to be the source of their church and community.

The question is when did the monks of the Monastery of Marun become Chalcedonians? Maronite and other writers claim that these monks adopted the formula of faith of the Council of Chalcedon when that council met in 451 and that has been the faith of Maronites since that time. However, the testimonies they present are neither decisive nor convincing. As far as the present writer can determine, no chronicler of that period, not even the Chalcedonian Evagrius who lived in Apamea,

mentions anything about these monks of Marun, their monastery, or their faith. We have to turn to the account of Dionysius Tal Mahri in order to establish the faith of these monks. Tal Mahri was the first to throw light on the religious identity of the monks of the Monastery of Marun.

Tal Mahri narrates the meeting between the Emperor Heraclius and the Syrian patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius Gammala (d. 631), in 629 during which the emperor tried to convince the patriarch and the twelve bishops in his company to endorse the formula of faith which maintained that the two natures of Christ were united in one will in conformity with Saint Cyril's doctrine of the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. The patriarch and his bishops refused to do so, contending that the formula presented was not different from the doctrine of Nestorius, which recognized that the two natures of Christ were still separate and distinct from each other even after their union in the Incarnation. What the patriarch and his bishops were trying to tell the emperor is that they found no difference between Nestorius's doctrine and the one defined by the Council of Chalcedon, and that both doctrines violate the faith instituted by the Council of Ephesus (431). The emperor became enraged at the refusal of the patriarch and his bishops to endorse his formula of faith and issued an order that anyone who refused to accept the formula be tortured and persecuted. We shall elaborate on this point and its relationships to the doctrine of Monothelitism later. It is sufficient to note here the repercussion of this imperial decree. Tal Mahri writes: "As a result of the persecution of the Orthodox [those who believed in One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos and rejected the Council of Chalcedon] many monks *accepted* the Council of Chalcedon including the monks of Beth Marun [the Monastery of Marun] together with the inhabitants of Mabug and Hims."[7]

From this account we learn that the monks of the Monastery of Marun must have accepted and embraced the faith of Chalcedon in the year 629, when the persecution of those who rejected the council began. Tal Mahri further points out that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were orthodox and held the Cyrilian doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*, but under duress they recognized the Council of Chalcedon. Now if these monks were Chalcedonians, Tal Mahri would never have stated that they had accepted the Council of Chalcedon. What convinces us even more that they were not Chalcedonians is that there was no reason for them to accept once more the faith of this council if they were already Chalcedonians. Furthermore, the threat of the

emperor to persecute those who rejected the council would have not extended to them if they were Chalcedonians at that time. The facts indicate that they must have been non-Chalcedonians and must have accepted the Council of Chalcedon in order to escape persecution. Adding more weight to Tal Mahri's account is the fact that this persecution was not directed primarily against these monks; it was directed against all those in Syria who refused to accept the Council of Chalcedon, those whom Tal Mahri calls Orthodox. This could not be a mistake committed by Tal Mahri or by Michael the Great, who has incorporated the account of Tal Mahri into his history. After all, considering the thousands of monks in Syria, it is unlikely that Tal Mahri singled out the monks of the Monastery of Marun as having accepted the Council of Chalcedon. What makes his account more credible is that of all the inhabitants of Syria, he mentions only the people of Mabug and Hims and the inhabitants of southern Syria as having endorsed the Council of Chalcedon. What we can deduce from Tal Mahri's statement is that the Monastery of Marun he mentions must have been one of the less prominent monasteries in Syria under the jurisdiction of the anti-Chalcedonian patriarchate of Antioch, and that its monks turned Chalcedonian from fear of persecution. From that time on they separated themselves from this anti-Chalcedonian patriarchate and later began to install patriarchs from their own monastery, thus becoming a separate religious group. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud avers that Tal Mahri's account convinced him that the monks of Marun were "Jacobites," that is, anti-Chalcedonians. He states that in the wake of the Council of Constantinople (536) these monks, either from fear or some other reason, deserted the Chalcedonian or Malkite group of the Church of Antioch and joined the "Jacobite" sector of that church. Dawud seems to suspect the religious integrity of these monks and observes that they were notorious for switching parties.[8] The fear Dawud alludes to must have been the result of Heraclius's persecution, for there is no evidence that any other power forced the monks to join the "Jacobite" group of the Church of Antioch, impelling us to believe that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Monophysites holding the doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria. In essence, Dawud believes that these monks and later Maronites were actually Monophysites or "Jacobites."[9]

There is evidence based on the writing of John Marun, presumably the first Maronite patriarch, that the Maronites were Monophysites or Syrian Orthodox. In the book entitled *The Exposition of the Faith* (which shall be discussed later and contained in the Vatican, MS 146, p.

4) John Marun states: "We believe that one of the Trinity, the Word, is of one substance and nature with us except sin. He is in two natures, the divine and the human: one Son, one Lord, one Christ. We also profess One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos as the holy Fathers have proclaimed."

The phrase *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* constitutes the words which embody the doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, whom John Marun considers a Holy Father. This is the orthodoxy which the Syrian Church of Antioch had accepted and which Severus, patriarch of Antioch, defended to the last breath. The Chalcedonians call this Christology of Saint Cyril Monophysitism, which they confuse with the opinions of Eutyches or of Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (d. 390).

In summation, we may safely state that not all the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Chalcedonians and defenders of the faith of the Council of Chalcedon. In fact, the majority of the Maronite monks renounced the Council of Chalcedon. There is testimony to this effect by Germanos, patriarch of Constantinople (d. 733), who labels the Maronites as heretics because they renounced the Fourth, Fifth, and the Sixth councils.[10] This leaves no room for doubt that not all the Maronite clergy and laity accepted the Council of Chalcedon. We shall elaborate on this testimony later.

With the previous account of Tal Mahri we reach the end of the first phase of the history of the Maronites. Our conclusion is that there lived in the early part of the fifth century an ascetic monk named Marun who was briefly mentioned by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus. Several monasteries by the name of Marun existed in Syria, including the one situated on al-Asi (Orontes) River, but we have no record of when this monastery was built, or that it was the origin of the Maronite Church and community. Furthermore, the Maronites are in disagreement over the source and derivation of the term "Maronite." While many of them claim that this term derives from the fifth-century Marun, or a monastery called the Monastery of Marun, their Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi, who follows al-Qila'i, affirms that the term "Maronite" derives from the "Blessed Marun, Patriarch of Great Antioch." Al-Duwayhi adds that "this is the opinion accepted by the Church of Rome, and which is in conformity with the tradition of the Maronite Church."[11] However, judging by the account of Tal Mahri, the monks of the Monastery of Marun came to be known as Maronites for the first time following the persecution by Heraclius in 629. Over a period of time after 629 they became a

separate denomination. Nevertheless, the faith of these monks and those who followed them before this date was the faith of the Syrian Church of Antioch, a faith based on the doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria.

We shall see later that the Maronites did not become a separate church distinguished from other churches in the East until the eighth century.

12

Heraclius and the Monothelitic Formula of Faith

THE FORMERLY OBSCURE and uncertain history of the monks of the Monastery of Marun was finally brought to light in the first half of the ninth century by Dionysius Tal Mahri. Tal Mahri, our earliest source on these monks, provides several accounts which explain the beginning of the Maronite church, community, patriarchate, and doctrinal belief. One of these accounts is associated with the religious policy of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius, who intended to preserve the unity of the empire. Vehement religious strife and dissension within the church had taken place since the first century of the Christian era, but it reached its climax with the Council of Chalcedon in 451 which, more than any other church council, disrupted the unity of the church, created ill will, and left spiritual sores within the church until this day. The ignominious persecution by both the Byzantine church and state, which upheld the Chalcedonian faith, of those who rejected this faith are facts of history. Many attempts were made by several emperors to reconcile the Chalcedonians with their opponents, but all failed. The earnest but clumsy and incongruous efforts of Emperor Justinian I in this regard are well known. In fact, what damaged the integrity of the Byzantine empire was that the inhabitants of the vital Eastern provinces of Egypt and Syria were predominantly opposed to the definition of faith by Chalcedon.[1] This opposition weakened the allegiance of the inhabitants of these provinces to the state, and finally Constantinople lost them, first to the Persians and later forever to the Arabs between 633 and 640.

When Heraclius came to power in 610, the rift within the church was already concretized. The antagonism between the Chalcedonians, who upheld the doctrine of *Two Natures* in Christ, and their opponents, who held *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*, was as alive and devastating as it was in the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon. Heraclius was faced with a serious problem, one which threatened the very existence of the Byzantine state. In 611 the Persians attacked Syria and occupied Antioch and Damascus. Three years later they marched on Palestine and after twenty days of siege occupied Jerusalem, plundering and killing. Among the precious valuables they carried off was the wood of the Holy Cross. In 618 they attacked and ravaged Egypt and marched into Cappadocia and the Byzantine country proper, and the capital, Constantinople, was within their reach. Heraclius's efforts to establish peace with the Persian King, Chosroes II, failed and, in desperation, the embattled emperor marshalled a huge army, attacking the Persians in 622 and driving them out of Armenia. From that time on the Persians were on the defensive and lost several battles to the Byzantines. By 628, the Persians had been driven out of the Byzantine provinces and peace was finally restored in 630. In the next decade, however, Egypt and Syria were captured by the Arabs.[2]

Like Justinian I, Heraclius must have considered that the integrity of the empire depended, among other things, on the reconciliation of antagonistic groups within the churches, mainly the Chalcedonians and their opponents. His main concern was not to heal the wounds of the church or to compromise the transactions of the Council of Chalcedon, but rather a political consideration to win back the anti-Chalcedonian provinces of Syria and Egypt, thus achieving the long desired unity of the empire. For this reason he had to find a formula of faith which would please the anti-Chalcedonians without compromising the faith of Chalcedon. This formula of faith was Monothelitism, which recognized that the two natures of Christ were united in one will and one energy or, to use Harnack's definition, the two natures of Christ, "effected every thing by means of one divine-human energy."[3]

The formula of one energy was not a novelty in the church. It dates back to the Pseudo-Areopagite (Epist. iv ad Caium).[4] In their letter to the Emperor Justinian I, the anti-Chalcedonian fathers who were recalled from exile to discuss church unity in Constantinople (535–536) not only quoted the Pseudo-Areopagite, but they also insisted that in the Incarnation there was but *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*.[5] According to Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople (610–638), this formula was used by Cyril of Alexandria, who, in his *In Joannem*, Tome IV, stated

that "Christ set forth one homogeneous energy through both (natures)."[6] Sergius also relates that this formula is found in the letter from his predecessor, Patriarch Menas (d. 552), to Pope Vigilius and again in Menas's letter to Emperor Justinian I; both letters were written in connection with the condemnation of the *Three Chapters* (that is, the letters of Ibas of Edessa to Maris, the doctrine of Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, and the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia). After condemning these *Three Chapters*, Pope Vigilius states, "Whoever does not confess that the only-begotten Word of God, that is Christ, is one substance, and one person and *unam operationem*, we anathematize."[7]

Some writers, who consider the formula of one energy a "heresy," attribute it to this Sergius, whom Theophanes and others arbitrarily refer to as a "Jacobite." Also they erroneously claim that he was the first to write about this doctrine.[8] While some of the writers say that when he was in Armenia, Emperor Heraclius came to know about this doctrine through the anti-Chalcedonian leader Paul, others maintain that the emperor must have learned about it through Sergius before meeting with Paul.[9] Mosheim, without historical foundation, states that both Paul and the Patriarch Athanasius suggested to Heraclius that the anti-Chalcedonian "Monophysites might be convinced to accept the Council of Chalcedon and be reconciled to the Greeks, provided that the Greeks would accept that in Jesus Christ, after the union of the two natures, there was but one will and one voluntary operation."[10] Another episode is related by the Roman Catholic writer Noel Alexander. He states that when Emperor Heraclius was in Jerapolis, in upper Syria, he was visited by Athanasius, "Patriarch of the Jacobites, a crafty and wicked man who won the emperor's confidence."[11] The emperor promised to make Athanasius patriarch of Antioch if he would accept the Council of Chalcedon and confess two natures. Athanasius then asked the emperor whether it was necessary to recognize in the person of Christ two wills and two operations or one will and one operation. Alexander continues that the "Eutychian" Athanasius was quite satisfied with this false doctrine and, as a result, was appointed patriarch of Antioch. He concludes that these three men, Athanasius, Sergius, and Cyrus were the originators of the Monothelite sect.[12]

Apart from the fact that the Patriarch Athanasius met with Heraclius, the rest of the episode related by Noel Alexander has no historical validity.

We may then judge that it is uncertain whether Sergius proposed the doctrine of the one energy to Heraclius or that the latter learned about it from Paul while he was in Armenia. To attribute the emperor's

knowledge of this doctrine to Athanasius, patriarch of Antioch, is refuted by the fact that prior to their meeting in 629 the emperor had already written to this patriarch about the unity of the two natures of Christ, stating that "what confirms this unity is the one energy as the blessed Cyril had said."[13] This was already pointed out by Pope Vigilius in the course of events which led to the condemnation of the *Three Chapters* at the Fifth Council. Therefore, it is erroneous to claim that the Patriarch Athanasius was the first to communicate this doctrine to the emperor. However, the emperor must have hoped that his doctrine would not offend the Chalcedonians, while at the same time please their opponents and unite the two groups. The result, however, was not what he had expected. While some influential clergy in Armenia, Syria, and Egypt endorsed the doctrine, many staunch Chalcedonian clergymen opposed it. We shall see later that Pope Honorius adhered to Monothelitism and was condemned for doing so.[14] One of those who opposed the new doctrine was Sophronius, who became patriarch of Jerusalem (633–634). He was supported by the Abbot Maximus, a die-hard Chalcedonian and opponent of the doctrine of one will and one energy in Christ (Monothelitism). Maximus had participated in the Lateran Council convened by Pope Martin I in 649, which condemned both the *Ecthesis* (638) of Heraclius and the *Typus* (648) of the Emperor Constans II (Constantine III), the latter document protecting those from legal prosecution who took either position in the matter of one will and one energy or two wills and two energies, but forbidding them under penalty from disputing the issue. Constans brought Maximus from Rome to Constantinople for trial and tried to force him to accept the *Typus*. Maximus refused to do so since the *Typus* contained a denial of the doctrine of the two wills in Christ which he defended vigorously. The emperor had him flogged and his tongue cut off to prevent him from teaching the doctrine of the two wills. Because Maximus continued to spread this doctrine through his writings, the emperor had his arms cut off and exiled him. He died in 662. Finally, Monothelitism was condemned by the Sixth Council in 680 as being "Monophysitism."[15] In this regard, Dionysius Tal Mahri remarks that for two hundred thirty years, from the time of the Council of Chalcedon (which he calls "the corrupt Council") to the time of the Sixth Council in 680, the Chalcedonians believed in two natures in Christ and yet maintained one person, one will, and one operation in Christ. He adds that at the time of the Sixth Council they increased their "corruption" of the doctrine by affirming that there were but two wills and two operations in Christ.[16] A final attempt to resolve the controversy over the doctrine of one will or two wills in Christ was made by Emperor

Philippicus (711–713), who intended to annul the decision of the Sixth Council and reject the teaching of Maximus of the two wills; for reasons unknown this attempt never materialized.[17]

Heraclius must have been convinced that the integrity of the Byzantine state depended, among other things, on the loyalty of the eastern provinces (mainly Syria and Egypt) and the settlement of religious conflict between the Chalcedonians and their opponents, for he began to enforce the doctrine of one will in Christ to bring about their unity. Tal Mahri provides us with the account of Heraclius's effort to establish peace among the churches and most particularly to reconcile the two antagonistic groups. When Heraclius was in Syria in 628 he visited the city of Orhoi (Edessa, present-day Urfa in Turkey), the center of Syriac Christianity at that time. He was astonished to find so few Christians professing the faith of the Council of Chalcedon. He determined to reconcile them with the Chalcedonian party and win their allegiance to the state by having them accept his formula of faith of one will in Christ, a formula which he thought would be acceptable to them. When he attended the service at the cathedral of the city, however, the officiating Bishop Isaiah refused to administer the holy Communion to him unless he condemned the Council of Chalcedon in writing. The emperor became enraged and expelled the bishop from the cathedral, which he then turned over to the Chalcedonian party. Later, in 629, he invited the Syrian patriarch of Antioch Athanasius (nicknamed Gammala) to discuss with him matters relating to the faith. The patriarch, accompanied by twelve bishops, went to meet with the emperor. After twelve days of debate the patriarch and his bishops refused to accept the emperor's formula of faith recognizing that the two natures of Christ were united in one will. This refusal was made on the grounds that the doctrine was in conformity with the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo, and they were not prepared to accept a formula of faith which they considered contrary to the doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria—that is, *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*[18] The rejection of the emperor's formula of faith by the patriarch and his bishops infuriated the emperor, who issued an order that those who refused to accept the Council of Chalcedon should be punished by having their noses cut off and their homes plundered. The persecution was directed against the anti-Chalcedonian Syrians who adhered to the doctrine of the *One Incarnate Nature*. As a result, many monks, including the monks of the Monastery of Marun, accepted the Council of Chalcedon and seized several churches and monasteries which belonged to the anti-Chalcedonians. When these anti-Chalcedonians complained to the

emperor of the seizure of their churches and monasteries he would not listen to their complaints.[19]

From this account we learn that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were not Chalcedonians prior to the reign of Heraclius. If they had been Chalcedonians, there would have been no reason for the emperor to persecute them. It is also evident that the persecution inflicted upon these monks forced them to recognize the Council of Chalcedon and its formula of faith in the form proposed by the emperor. According to Tal Mahri, the inhabitants of Mabug (Manbij) and Hims and many people from southern Syria also accepted the Council of Chalcedon. Their acceptance suggests that they were non-Chalcedonian and maintained the formula, *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos.* Again, if the people who seized the churches and monasteries from the anti-Chalcedonians were upholders of the faith of Chalcedon (that is, if they were Malkites), Tal Mahri would have said so. But they were not, and once more we are able to deduce from Tal Mahri's account that these people, including the monks of the Monastery of Marun, displayed cruelty and seized several of the churches and monasteries from those who, despite the emperor's order, remained steadfast in their rejection of the Council of Chalcedon. Tal Mahri's account induces us to believe that these people, including the monks of the Monastery of Marun, were anti-Chalcedonians or Monophysites.[20] The point is that at this time there were only two major denominations in Syria—the Chalcedonian Malkites and the anti-Chalcedonian Monophysites or "Jacobites:" there were no Maronites. The two denominations were in constant conflict with each other over the Council of Chalcedon. And since Tal Mahri does not state that those who seized and plundered the churches of the Orthodox (Monophysites), namely the monks of the Monastery of Marun, were Malkites, it is imperative that they must have been a group of Monophysites who for some unknown reason were not on good terms with the rest of the Monophysites or their church. However, although the monks of the Monastery of Marun and the inhabitants of Mabug, Hims, and southern Syria proclaimed the Council of Chalcedon and seized the churches and monasteries of the anti-Chalcedonians, there is no indication that a Maronite community or a Maronite patriarchate had been established. Such a community may have been in the formation but it had not yet assumed the full status of a recognized denomination. It could well be that the people who accepted the Council of Chalcedon and the Monothelite formula proposed by Heraclius joined the monks of the Monastery of Marun to form a new denomination. It could also be that some Syrian orthodox (Monophysite) bishops, seeing that the

majority of their congregation had accepted the Council of Chalcedon, found no alternative but to follow their congregation and profess the Council of Chalcedon, thus forming a new Maronite denomination. This is sheer conjecture, however; available sources allow that the emergence of the Maronites as a separate community had to wait until the next century. In fact, these monks of Marun and the people who joined them after 630 continued to profess the faith of Chalcedon, but in a Monothelite connotation.[21] Like the Chalcedonian Malkites, they maintained that the two natures of Christ were united in one person and in one will. They only became distinct from each other after 680, when the Malkites accepted the doctrine of the two wills in Christ propagated by Maximus and confirmed by the Sixth Council. According to the celebrated Maphrian of the Syrian Church, Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286), in his *Mnurath Qudshe (Lamp of the Sanctuaries*, Book 4, Chapter 3), the Greeks or Byzantines professed the doctrine of one will in Christ until the time of Maximus: in other words, they were Monothelites. No one has illustrated this point as lucidly and excellently as Tal Mahri. Here is his statement in full:

> We have formerly discussed the heresy of Maximus [of two wills in Christ] and how Constantine [Pogonatus] introduced it into the Byzantine Church after it had been obliterated by his father. Now we want to discuss the rift which took place between them [the Chalcedonians in 727] on account of this heresy [two wills] was maintained in the land of the Greeks [Byzantines] but was not at all known in Syria. Now [the year 727] it was planted by the captives and plunderers who accompanied the Arab armies and lived in Syria. Those who became corrupted with this heresy were the inhabitants of the metropolises, their bishops and leaders of whom was Sergius, son of Mansur [perhaps father of the Chalcedonian Saint John of Damascus]. Sergius harassed the believers [anti-Chalcedonians] in Damascus and Hims not only to drop the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*, from the Trisagion, but coaxed many of us [anti-Chalcedonians] to accept his heresy. Also corrupted by this heresy were the Sees of Jerusalem, Antioch and Edessa and the Sees in other cities which since the time of Heraclius were controlled by the Chalcedonians. However, the monks of Beth [Monastery] of Marun, their bishops and few other people did not accept this doctrine [two wills]. But all of the inhabitants of the cities and the bishops accepted it. And a great deal of quarrels and anathemas took place because of it. The Chalcedonian followers of the Monastery of Marun reviled the followers of Maximus by calling them Nestorians, heathens and Jews and telling them that, "you do not confess that Christ is God, that he was born of a Virgin and that He

> was crucified and suffered in his body." But you say that he was a simple man and a special person who was separate and remote from God, that he feared death. For this reason He cried, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt," as if there were two wills, one for the Father and one for the Son, that there were in Christ two separate and divided wills opposing each other." The followers of Maximus reviled the followers of Marun [the monks of the Monastery of Marun] saying, "you do not confess the same faith of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo, that you do not believe that in Christ there are two independent natures with their properties and operations preserved. For if there were two natures in Christ, it follows that there should also be in Him two independent wills and operations. But you confess the doctrine of Cyril [of Alexandria] and Severus [of Antioch] who maintained that in Christ there was but one person and one nature, and that one is His operation, power and authority." They also called them Severians, Jacobites and Theophaschites. And very well these [the monks of Marun and their followers] answered those [the Maximians] saying, "If Christ is known in two natures with their properties and actions preserved as is stated in the *Tome* of Leo and the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon, it is imperative also to believe in two wills, two operations, two persons, nay, also two Sons and two Christs."[22]

Tal Mahri comments that, in all fairness, these two groups should not have antagonized each other because both of them held identical faiths, the faith of Leo and that of the Council of Chalcedon.[23] He then goes on to cite a prime example of the doctrinal division in the congregation of Aleppo. This congregation was split into two hostile groups: one followed the Maronites, the other joined the followers of Maximus who believed in two wills in Christ. The fight of these two groups for possession of the great cathedral in Aleppo caused the Muslim governor of the city to divide the cathedral by ordering a wooden partition erected in the middle of the church so each group had its own section. However, the altercation continued between the members of the two groups, joined by the women, with actual fighting taking place inside the church building. Finally, ashamed of their indecorous behavior, the two groups reconciled and became followers of Maximus, maintaining two wills in Christ.[24]

This indicates that in the middle of the eighth century when this episode took place, the Maronites were distinct from the Malkites. While the Malkites adopted the belief in two wills in Christ, the Maronites, with the exception of the congregation of Aleppo, remained Monothelites and maintained one will in Christ.

13

The Malkites, the Maronites, and the Sixth Council

Tal Mahri plainly explains that from 629, when Heraclius imposed Monothelitism as a new doctrine, until the time of Emperor Constantine IV Pogonatus (668–685), no one in Syria discussed or even recognized that belief in two natures in Christ also necessitated recognizing two wills in Him. Both the Chalcedonian Malkites and the Chalcedonian Maronites held the doctrine that the two natures of Christ were united in one person, one will and one voluntary operation. In a word, both groups were Monothelites, and their embracing the faith of Chalcedon was the only major theological difference between them and the majority of the Syrians who rejected that faith. The two groups must have lived in harmony since they were bound by the same faith. According to Tal Mahri, however, in the year 727 trouble occurred between them over the introduction of the doctrine of the two wills in Christ. Tal Mahri calls this doctrine "the heresy of Maximus" because, more than anyone else, Maximus had defended it with his own life. We know that this doctrine was adopted by the Sixth Council assembled in 680 under Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, and it was made an article of faith. It was at this council that the doctrine of Monothelitism was condemned and anathemas were pronounced against those who professed it. Among those suffering such treatment were Menas, patriarch of Constantinople, and Popes Vigilius and Honorius.[1] This confirms Bar Hebraeus's statement that until the time of Maximus, Theodore of Har-

ran and John of Damascus, the Byzantines professed the doctrine of one will in Christ. The new doctrine of two wills in Christ, made official in the Byzantine country (Asia Minor) proper, was transmitted into Syria not by Byzantine missionaries but by Byzantine captives or people deported by the Arabs into Syria, according to Tal Mahri. Perhaps because of the warfare between the Arabs and the Byzantines, these Byzantine captives were dislodged and finally made their way into Syria. These arrivals were not only Chalcedonians but held the doctrine of two wills in Christ, which was a novelty to the Syrians. As this new doctrine spread throughout Syria, the inhabitants of several cities (for example, Damascus, Aleppo, and Hims) and many bishops and dignitaries embraced it. One of these dignitaries was Sergius, son of Mansur, who coerced the Syrians into accepting this doctrine. The Syrians subjected to Mansur's coercion were certainly not the Chalcedonian Malkites who never recited the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*; they were the followers of the monks of Marun, who recited the Trisagion with this phrase and who adopted Monothelitism during the time of Heraclius. Some, too, were anti-Chalcedonian Syrians who belonged to the church of the Patriarch Dionysius Tal Mahri and upheld the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. It seems evident from Tal Mahri's account that between 680 and 727 the Chalcedonian Sees of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Edessa, as well as some smaller towns in Syria, embraced the doctrine of two wills in Christ.

The key point in Tal Mahri's account is that the monks of Beth Marun (Monastery of Marun), its bishops, and some other people refused this doctrine. They must have done so because they were already Monothelites, having held the doctrine of one will in Christ from the time of Heraclius.[2] Tal Mahri adds that the introduction of the doctrine of two wills in Christ resulted in disputes and altercations between the Chalcedonian Malkites and the Maronites, who were also Chalcedonians. The disagreement was not a matter of definition of the faith of Chalcedon, but whether the two natures of Christ were united in one will and whether it was possible that after their union these two natures were still separate from each other. Tal Mahri mentions the kinds of theological charges made by the two groups and thus explains the doctrine supported by the Maronite monks and their followers. From his account we learn that the Maronites, or as he calls them "followers of Marun," reviled and accused the followers of Maximus for not professing Christ to be God, for professing that Christ was not born of the Virgin; that He was crucified and suffered in the flesh; and most particularly that He was a simple man and a special *Qnumo* (a Syriac term

meaning person); that He was separate from God, or that He and the Father are two separate entities and for this reason He feared death and cried in his agony to the Father to pass the cup of death from Him, saying fatalistically, "Not as I will but as you will," as if there were two wills, one for the Father and another for the Son. Maronites accused Maximus's followers further of maintaining that the two wills of Christ were not only different but contradictory and warred against each other. What the monks of Marun intended to say is that in the Incarnation of God the Word one can no longer recognize two wills but only one will in Christ. This recalls the argument of the celebrated Saint Cyril of Alexandria against the whole theology of the Antiochian school, (particularly the teaching of Theodore of Mopsuestia) and later against Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople. These men recognized two separate natures in Christ with two hypostases, thus making a sharp distinction between the Christ who was born of the Father before all the worlds and the Christ born of the Virgin Mary. As a result of this belief, Nestorius refused to call the Virgin Mary *Theotokos* (the Mother of God); he preferred to call her *Christotokos* (the Mother of Christ), as if the Christ who was born of her was not the eternal Son, or God, but a mere man. In this context the monks of Marun accused the followers of Maximus of upholding the Nestorian heresy condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431. They tacitly support their argument with Saint Cyril's thesis that in the Incarnation of God the Word—Christ—we can only recognize *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos or the enfleshed God*, and consequently and logically we should also recognize in Him one will.

This, to be sure, is a very complex and sensitive theological problem which falls beyond the scope of this book.[3] However, although these monks held the faith of Chalcedon, they produced the same argument against the followers of Maximus that Saint Cyril and later all the anti-Chalcedonians had used to refute the doctrine confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon which emphasized the separation of the two natures of Christ after their union. This is strange indeed for these Maronite monks and all later Maronites who professed Monothelitism; if they maintained that the two natures of Christ were united in one will, it is logically imperative that they should also have professed that the two natures were united in such an ineffable manner as to constitute one nature. In other words, if the outcome of the Incarnation of God the Word is *One Incarnate Nature*, as Saint Cyril emphasized, it would be similarly logical to maintain that the outcome of the Incarnation of the same God the Word would be one will. In this respect the doctrine of the monks of Marun was consistent with the orthodox doctrine of Saint Cyril, which the

Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch has maintained to the present day. In fact, the argument of the monks of Marun and their followers against those who held the doctrine of two wills in Christ compels us to conclude that these Maronite monks were not Chalcedonians before they adopted Monothelitism under pressure from Heraclius. After they adopted this doctrine and after they accepted the Council of Chalcedon, these monks retained their belief in the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*, but they could not profess it openly for fear of what the Chalcedonian Emperor might do. It follows that the Maronite monks, coerced into accepting the Council of Chalcedon but in a Monothelitic connotation, paid only lip service to the faith of the council; their true belief, as ritual and prayer books demonstrate, continuing to be that of the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* (Monophysitism).

Nothing can better illustrate this thesis than the counteraccusation made by Maximus's followers, that the Maronite monks were not holding the doctrine as set forth by the Council of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo. What is implied is that the monks did not believe that the two natures of Christ were united in one person yet remained distinct after their union. They retorted that if Christ had two independent natures it was necessary that He should also have two independent wills and independent voluntary operations. The followers of Maximus accused the Maronite monks of holding the doctrine of Cyril and of Severus of Antioch, recognizing in Christ one nature, one person, one will, one power, one operation, and one authority. For this reason the monks were called "Severians," "Jacobites," and "Theopaschites," that is, believing that the Godhead had suffered on the cross. The same argument was used by Nestorius in his controversy with Saint Cyril and his supporters, whom Nestorius erroneously accused of a doctrine which maintained that "the God in Christ has suffered."[4]

Tal Mahri concludes this portion of his account by stating that both groups should not have exchanged charges and accusations because in truth both were Chalcedonians. This, however, does not indicate, as Maronite Bishop Yusuf Deryan erroneously affirms, that the two groups were arguing simply over the interpretation of the doctrine of the two natures and two wills in Christ versus that of one nature and one will in Christ. It does indicate, as Deryan alleges, that the Maronite monks, though Chalcedonians, did not understand this new doctrine of the two wills in Christ and rejected it because they found it in conformity with the teaching of Nestorius. Moreover, Deryan is incorrect in stating that the followers of Maximus charged the monks of Marun with holding the same doctrine as that of Cyril of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch, in

an attempt to bring ridicule and revilement upon them. Deryan compounds his error when he argues that if the doctrine of the two wills were introduced "canonically" (that is, through proper ecclesiastical channels) into Syria, those who adhered to it would have invoked the transactions of the Sixth Council in their arguments with opponents. In other words, the Sixth Council's transactions condemning Monothelitism were known officially in Syria and the Monothelite monks of Marun should have observed them.[5] Kamal Salibi iterates this same idea, but it is unconvincing. Salibi states that after the Sixth Council condemned Monothelitism, word of the position of what he calls the "universal church" on this doctrine had not yet reached the valley of the Orontes (al-Asi) River where the monks of Marun lived. He says that for this reason, "the Maronite people continued to hold Monothelitism in some form for many centuries."[6] However, Salibi admits that the monks of the Monastery of Marun professed the doctrine of one will in Christ "in its primitive form, which emphasized one operation in Christ but did not define His will."[7]

The claim of Deryan that the whole argument over the one or two wills in Christ was caused by a misunderstanding of the definition of theological terms like person, nature, operation, and will is untenable.[8] Equally untenable is Salibi's claim that the monks of the Monastery of Marun emphasized one operation rather than one will in Christ.[9] There is no historical evidence to support any such claim. Certainly the monks of the Monastery of Marun must have comprehended the doctrine of one will in Christ and its theological connotation. In fact, they accepted the Monothelitism of Emperor Heraclius, a uniform Monothelitism untempered by the interpretation of a voluntary operation or will. We learn from Tal Mahri that the whole issue was serious to the point of causing fierce and heated argument and even physical violence. Calling the Maronite monks "Severians" and "Jacobites," the followers of Maximus intended no jest. They realized that along with being superficially Chalcedonians, the monks must have still held the same belief as Severus of Antioch; in brief, they were Monophysites. Deryans's claim that Tal Mahri, because he shared their faith, injected the names of Cyril of Alexandria and Severus of Antioch into the argument between the Maronite monks and the followers of Maximus is without historical support. What Deryan is attempting to establish is that since Tal Mahri is a "Jacobite" he found it expedient to insert the name of Cyril in this context to prove that the Monothelite monks of Marun held the same belief as Cyril.[10] In Deryan's view "Jacobites" always interpreted Cyril's refutation of Nestorius in their own peculiar way to substantiate their

belief in *One Incarnate Nature and One Will of the Divine Logos*. It should be remembered that the members of the Council of Chalcedon interpreted Cyril's doctrine in such a way as to justify their compromise with Nestorianism and to validate their new definition of the faith: two natures of Christ united in one person yet remaining separate and distinct from each other after their union, in conformity with the *Tome* of Leo.[11]

There is strong evidence that the monks of Marun and their followers were cognizant of the Sixth Council's condemnation of Monothelitism. As we have seen, Tal Mahri states that the doctrine of the two wills in Christ was introduced into Syria by Byzantine captives and by refugees who accompanied the Arab armies and then settled in Syria.[12] This indicates that the transactions of the Sixth Council were transmitted into Syria, and that the Maronite monks and their followers were therefore aware of them.

In Syria Secunda, where the monks of Marun lived, some people were not totally unaware of the Sixth Council and its purpose. The minutes of the sixteenth session of this council held on August 9 inform us of a priest from Apamea named Constantine and his doctrine of Monothelitism. Constantine, who was in Constantinople, where the council assembled, asked for admission to the council to present his formula of faith regarding the issue of two wills in Christ, discussed by the council. Constantine was admitted to the Council and addressed its members. He told them that he was a priest from the church of the holy city of Apamea in Syria Secunda, and that he was ordained a priest by Abraham, bishop of Arethusa (present day al-Rastan between Hims and Hama). When asked to present his formula of faith, he requested the members of the council to grant him a period of six days to finish writing his formula of faith in Syriac. The members of the council insisted that he submit his formula of faith immediately and in Greek, which he spoke fluently. Constantine stated that in his formula there were two energies in Christ and these energies belonged to the properties of His two natures. Constantine added, however, that Christ had only one personal will: the will of the *Logos* (God the Word). the members of the council understood him to mean that Christ has only one divine will; therefore, he was accused of being an Apollinarian and was expelled from the meeting.[13]

We do not know how this learned priest knew about the Sixth Council. What we do know is that the Sixth Council must have been known to the church in Syria Secunda and very likely was also known to the monks of the Monastery of Marun, to whose district the priest Con-

stantine belonged. It is obvious that Constantine was a Monothelite priest ordained by a Monothelite bishop and belonging to a Monothelite church. In his statement to the council he emphatically declared his belief in one will in Christ. He could not have been an anti-Chalcedonian or a Monophysite priest; otherwise, the council would not have allowed him admission to its sessions, unless he were to renounce his belief in the one nature. He must have been either a Chalcedonian Malkite or a Maronite whose intention was to prove to the council the traditional belief of the Eastern church regarding the doctrine of the one will in Christ. The episode of Constantine does not contradict the account of Tal Mahri but corroborates it. While the Sixth Council and its transactions must have been known in Syria Secunda and most likely in the rest of Syria, we find no attempt by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus or the Church of Constantinople to impose the doctrine of the two wills in Christ on the people of Syria. Had the emperor wished to do so, he would have used force as his persuasion. But Emperor Constantine could never have imposed the transactions of this council on the inhabitants of Syria for the simple reason that Syria had become an Arab province in 634. The situation had radically changed since 629–630, when Heraclius imposed Monothelitism on the Syrians at a time when that country was still in the Byzantine domain. Because of the change of events there was no opportunity for the Byzantine emperor through the power of the state to introduce in Syria the doctrine of two wills. This doctrine, as Tal Mahri rightfully states, was planted by Byzantine captives and refugee victims of the warfare between the Arabs and Byzantines. In time the doctrine was accepted by the Syrian Malkites though it was rejected by the Maronites. It become, as Tal Mahri explains, a source of trouble and animosity between the two groups.

14

Establishment of the Maronites as a Separate Church

THE FAILURE of the Byzantine state and church to introduce in Syria the doctrine of two wills in Christ does not mean that the Byzantine emperors made no effort to do so. In fact, we learn of such efforts from the *Ten Treatises* of Maronite Bishop Tuma of Kfartab.[1] This work is our main source on Tuma and informs us that he was a Maronite bishop of Kfartab near Aleppo. In 1089 he wrote letters to Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch Yuhanna (John) VII (1088–1106); contained in them are the *Ten Treatises* defending the doctrine of one will in Christ against the doctrine of two wills in Christ upheld by the patriarch. The patriarch, we are told, burned Tuma's letters, but Tuma wrote a fresh copy of them. Toward the end of the eleventh century when he was preaching in Lebanon, Tuma made yet another copy of the *Treatises* at the request of a priest from the Lebanese village of Farsha in the district of Jubayl.[2] In these *Treatises* Tuma produces a penetrating theological argument which reveals his thorough knowledge of the doctrinal disputes on the oneness or duality of the wills of Christ. However, in his *Treatises*, he seems to treat Maximus, a defender of the doctrine of two wills in Christ, with contempt. He claims that Maximus was raised in Tiberias, the illegitimate offspring of a gentile woman and a Samaritan father. This claim is historically groundless. The charges are of the blatantly false type which disputants over Christian dogma sometimes resort to (as in the case of the antagonists of Severus of Antioch).[3]

Our concern, however, is the part of Tuma's *Treatises* which reveals that a Byzantine emperor did communicate with some Syrians to convince them that they should profess the doctrine of two wills in Christ. In the "Fourth Treatise," Tuma informs us that there was in the time of Maximus a Byzantine emperor, whom he calls "Marcian," who ruled jointly with his brother.[4] This seems to be a historical error for there was no emperor named "Marcian" who ruled jointly with his brother in the time of Maximus, who died in 662. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud maintains that in this context Marcian is meant to be Emperor Constantine IV Pogonatus, who, in the sixteenth session of the Sixth Council, was hailed as "the new Marcian."[5] Dawud is incorrect because Maximus, whom Tuma associates with Constantine IV as the "new Marcian" was persecuted and died six years before this emperor ascended the throne in 668. Be that as it may, Tuma continues to say that Maximus was able to convince the emperor and his brother that it was more accurate to maintain two wills rather than one will in Christ on the ground that if Christ had two natures united in one person, He should also have two wills united in the same person. Maximus also advised them to write letters to the people in Syria and Lebanon, inviting them to profess this doctrine of maximus. The people of Syria and Lebanon responded by declaring their intention of following the faith professed by the monks of the Monastery of *Maran* (a Syriac term meaning the Lord Christ). This monastery was located on the river al-Asi (Orontes) outside the city of Hama, and eight hundred monks resided there. When Maximus's letters reached the monastery, the monks were repulsed by them. The monks replied that they could only accept the faith instituted by the fathers at the Council of Nicea (325), and the succeeding four councils which confirmed that faith, and therefore they would not accept the doctrine of Maximus of two wills in Christ, even under coercion. They pointed out, however, that they would be willing to debate with Maximus in Antioch, and if they saw that the Holy Spirit was with him, they would accept his doctrine. The monks handed their reply to a messenger to deliver to the emperor. When the monks sent their letter to the emperor the invading Arab armies had just conquered Syria (including Jerusalem) and Egypt, thus severing relations between them. The Syrian people became confirmed in the holy faith instituted by the twelve apostles and the five councils. The rest of the "Fourth Treatise" contains an account of Heraclius's rejection of the doctrine of Maximus, and how the disciples of Maximus, through bribery, spread the doctrine of two wills in Christ in the West. Bishop Tuma states, however, "We in the East [Syria] including the inhabitants of Aleppo, Hama and Hims, as well as the Mountain of

Lebanon, remained faithful to the doctrine of the five councils while the disciples of Maximus remained separate from us."[6]

From the former account of Tuma we may infer that there was some kind of communication between the Byzantine emperors and the eastern provinces of Syria and Egypt regarding the doctrine of one will in Christ. This doctrine of one will in Christ, it should be remembered, is in conformity with the Christology of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, but it did not become the subject of controversy until the beginning of the seventh century when Heraclius came to power in 610. We also know that Maximus attracted the attention of Heraclius and became the emperor's chief secretary. Maximus, who was more inclined toward ascetic life than service to the emperor, left this position in 630 and became a monk at the Chrysopolis (present-day Scutari) Monastery on the shore opposite Constantinople. In 633, we find him in Alexandria in the company of Sophronius (later to become Chalcedonian patriarch of Jerusalem), disputing the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism).[7] It was in the second year, according to Tuma, that the Arab armies conquered Syria, and the relationship between the Byzantine emperors and their Syrian subjects and church leaders was cut off. Although some of the inhabitants of Syria were Chalcedonians, they continued to profess one will in Christ; in other words, they and their anti-Chalcedonian counterparts, the "Monophysites," professed one will in Christ. It should also be remembered that although there were sporadic disputes about the one or two wills in Christ (particularly in Jerusalem as seen earlier), the majority of the people of Syria had not been exposed to the new teaching of two wills in Christ. In fact, this teaching did not finally become a doctrine of the Chalcedonian church until the year 680, when the Sixth Council assembled to condemn the doctrine of one will and to confirm the doctrine of two wills in Christ. It may have been after this year that the new doctrine was introduced into Syria by Byzantine captives and refugees who settled in Syria as a result of the constant warfare between the Arabs and the Byzantines. These refugees residing in Syria must have spread the doctrine of two wills among the Chalcedonian Malkites. They also must have informed the Malkites of the Sixth Council's confirmation of the doctrine of two wills and the condemnation of the doctrine of one will in Christ; as a result the Malkites began to profess the new doctrine of two wills. The introduction of this doctrine must have created a schism between the Malkites and the Maronites because although both groups were Chalcedonians, the Maronites believed in one will in Christ. Tal Mahri elaborates on the rift over this issue between the two groups. Tuma of Kfartab also confirms

it, although he makes no reference to Tal Mahri.[8] We may then assume that the Maronites became distinct from the Malkites through the former's profession of one will in Christ (Monothelitism). Tuma of Kfartab is explicit on the distinction between the two groups when he tells the Chalcedonian Malkites' patriarch, John VII, that by recognizing two wills in Christ the Malkites have divided the same Christ into two Christs. However, we find his argument most peculiar since, like his antagonists the Malkites, Bishop Tuma, a Maronite, recognizes two separate natures in Christ. If recognizing two separate wills in Christ means dividing Him into two separate Christs, then, why does not the recognition of two natures in the same Christ divide Him into two Christs? Tuma shows even more anti-Chalcedonian sentiment in his "Third Treatise," when, to support the doctrine of one will in Christ, he cites the commentary on Christ's words by the father of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Jacob of Sarug: "My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matthew 26:39). We know that Jacob of Sarug is anti-Chalcedonian and a champion of the orthodox doctrine of Saint Cyril of Alexandria, that is, *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*.[9] By citing Jacob of Sarug as his authority to prove the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism), Tuma confirms our belief that the Maronites were part of the Syrian Orthodox Church and that they venerated its fathers and accepted their teaching as authoritative. There is no evidence to support al-Qilaʿi's opinion that Tuma was a bishop of the Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) Church.[10]

We should not be misled by Tuma of Kfartab when he states that the separation between the Malkites and the Maronites was a de facto separation which made the latter a distinct church with its own patriarchate. Rather we should remember that in the latter part of the seventh century the Maronites were still a religious group without distinct ecclesiastical hierarchy, while the Malkites were an already established denomination with a patriarchate and hierarchy, constituting the segment of the patriarchate of Antioch which accepted the definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon. From 638, when Heraclius published his *Ecthesis* confirming Monothelitism, until 680, when the Sixth Council condemned this doctrine, these Chalcedonian Malkites were Monothelites holding the doctrine of one will in Christ. From 680 until the sixteenth century the Maronites were still Monothelites, although they held the faith of Chalcedon simultaneously.

If the Maronites were still a religious group in the first part of the eighth century, as is evidenced in their feuds with the Malkites (especially in Aleppo where, according to Tal Mahri, the two groups divided

the church building between them), when did the Maronites become a distinct denomination with a separate patriarchate? Once more we should refer to Tal Mahri, who writes:

> In the year [745] Marwan the King [Caliph] of the Arabs permitted the Chalcedonians [Malkites] to consecrate a patriarch for their denomination who was Theophilact Ibn Qanbara from Harran. Theophilact was Marwan's goldsmith. He obtained from the Caliph an order and troops to persecute the Maronites. When he arrived at the Monastery of Marun he harassed its monks to accept the doctrine of Maximus [two wills in Christ] and desist from reciting the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*. Agonized by affliction, the monks promised Theophilact that on the next day they would submit to his order. Now there was an old monk in the company of Theophilact whom he loved. This monk entered the church of the Monastery and striking the altar with his fist he cried "Unclean altar, tomorrow you will become holy." At that moment he was stricken with divine justice and became possessed by a demon. He remained tormented all night long before he finally died. Ibn Qanbara became extremely grieved over the death of the monk and was seized with fear. He left the body of the deceased monk for the monks of the Monastery to bury and departed without accomplishing his purpose. *And the Maronites remained as they are today consecrating for themselves a patriarch and bishops from their monastery*. They are distinguished from the followers of Maximus for their belief in one will in Christ and for reciting the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*. But they accept the Council of Chalcedon.
>
> Then Ibn Qanbara went to Manbij and tried to force the Chalcedonians in that city to accept the doctrine of two wills in Christ and desist from reciting the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us*. He betrayed them to Marwan who fined them four thousand dinars. The trouble which had happened in Aleppo happened in this city, too. Finally, Andrew the Maronite obtained an order from the Caliph and built a church for the Maronites in Manbij. *They [the Maronites] then became separate from the followers of Maximus*. And many disgusting and abominable affairs happened between these two groups.[11]

This episode must have occurred in the second year of the reign of the Umayyad Caliph Marwan II (744–750), nicknamed al-Himar ("the Ass"). The Malkites in Syria had been without a patriarch for almost forty years, perhaps because of internal strife within their church or deterioration of their ecclesiastical conditions. It may have been, as Asse-

mani writes, that the Muslims prevented them from having their own patriarch.[12] Certainly it was not because of the intrigues of the "Jacobites" as Asad Rustam has claimed, for there is no historical evidence to support this idea.[13] In 742, however, the Umayyad Caliph Hisham Ibn Abd al-Malik allowed the Malkites to install a patriarch for their community. They chose a certain monk named Stephen, and he became Stephen IV on April 19, 742.[14] Three years later Stephen fell into disfavor with the Umayyad Caliph al-Walid II (743–744), who ordered the tongues of Stephen and Peter, bishop of Damascus, cut off, and then banished them to al-Yaman.[15] When Marwan II came to power he favored Theophilact as patriarch of the Malkites in 745. The caliph favored Theophilact because he was his goldsmith and because, as Tal Mahri states, the caliph was an avaricious person who loved gold.[16] While Tal Mahri says nothing about whether Theophilact had held a church office before being chosen patriarch by the Caliph, Theophanes says he was a priest in Edessa before he became patriarch.[17]

From the above account of Tal Mahri we learn that the Malkites and the Maronites, although Chalcedonians, were separate groups. While the Malkites had a patriarch, the Maronites were without a head or a patriarch. Now if the Maronites did have a patriarch, Tal Mahri, himself a patriarch, would certainly have mentioned it. Indeed, Theophanes and other historians would also have mentioned this fact. Bishop Deryan speculates that the Maronites had a patriarch. He states that Tal Mahri had mentioned that the Monastery of Marun had a bishop, whom Deryan alleges was a "catholicos" or a leader of the Maronites and that for his honorable position the Maronites called him a "patriarch."[18] The fact is that in 745, when Theophilact marched against the Monastery of Marun, the Maronites had no patriarch, although they had an abbot and bishops in that monastery.[19] There is no evidence that they had a "catholicos" who became a "patriarch." According to church hierarchy the office of catholicos was higher than that of bishop and lower than that of patriarch, and that it takes a patriarch and three bishops to ordain a catholicos, and the Monastery of Marun had no patriarch in order to ordain this alleged Maronite "catholicos." Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud theorizes that the Maronites were at this time under the jurisdiction of the Malkite patriarch, and that when Tal Mahri called Theophilact the patriarch of the Chalcedonians he meant by the latter term both the Malkites and the Maronites; otherwise, he would have stated that Theophilact was the patriarch of the Malkites only. What Dawud intends to say is that the Maronite clergy received their ordination from the Malkite patriarch.[20] Such an assumption is

historically groundless. Available evidence shows that the Maronites had no patriarch until the middle of the eighth century. They began to install patriarchs from their own monastery only after their agonizing experience with Theophilact. It is true that in the eighth century both the Malkites and the Maronites were Chalcedonians. But historical fact does not indicate that the Maronites were under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Malkite patriarchs, or that they had any church dignitary occupying the office of a "catholicos." Tal Mahri, our only historical source on this issue, informs us that the monks of the Monastery of Marun decided to install their own patriarch after being persecuted by Theophilact, who was supported by the Umayyad Caliph. They did so, perhaps, because they wanted to have their own leadership and hierarchy in order to gain the same recognition and treatment from the ruling authority as the Malkites did. The number of the Maronites in the cities of Hims, Hama, Aleppo, Manbij, and others had increased to such a degree as to warrant the establishment of a Maronite identity in 745. Obviously, they would not have dared to assert their identity with Emperor Heraclius imposing his Monothelitism on them unless they had felt sufficiently strong. But how did these Maronite monks install a patriarch from their monastery? It should be remembered that according to canonical law three bishops may consecrate a patriarch, and there must have been more than three bishops at the Monastery of Marun. We shall treat the Maronite patriarchate later.

Deryan has mistaken Tal Mahri's statement that "the Maronites remained as they are today consecrating a patriarch and bishops from their monastery" to mean that they must have consecrated their own patriarch before 745, thus achieving ecclesiastical independence at that time; Deryan conjectures if this was not Tal Mahri's intent, he would not have said that, "Since then the Maronites began to consecrate a patriarch for their monastery."[21] In fact, Tal Mahri means the Maronites began to install a patriarch from their monastery in the year 745, but certainly not before this date. By "today" Tal Mahri meant not the year 745, but the year in which he was writing his history; that is, about 843, two years before his death.[22] In essence, Tal Mahri states that from the year 745 to the year 843 when he finished his history, the Maronites continued to install patriarchs from within their monastery. It was from this date onward that they could claim to have their own leadership. The eighth-century Syriac chronicle written by an anonymous monk from the Monastery of Qartmin cited by Rev. Daww to prove that the Maronites emerged as a separate church and hierarchy during the last quarter of the seventh century is irrevelant and has no connection with this subject.

Daww's observations on this subject are also irrelevant. This anonymous chronicle demonstrates only that at the end of the seventh century the Maronites were still a Monothelite religious group.[23] However, we may state with certainty that only in the eighth century did ancient church writers refer to the Maronites as a distinct Christian sect. The celebrated Bar Hebraeus, while discussing the Abbasid Caliph al-Mahdi (775–785) states that the "Caliph's chief astrologer, Theophile Ibn Tuma al-Ruhawi, was of the same faith as the Maronites of Lebanon, one of the Christian 'madhahib' (sects) in that country."[24]

15

Who is John Marun?

According to Tal Mahri, from the year 745 until the time he was writing his history, the monks of the Monastery of Marun had installed patriarchs from the members of their monastery, but he mentions nothing about who ordained these patriarchs or the validity of their ordination. Indeed, he mentions nothing about the identity of the first patriarch ordained in that monastery or his activities, leaving us completely in the dark about the first "Maronite patriarch." It is futile to search for the identity of this patriarch in ancient secular or church histories, though some Maronite sources mention the name of a certain Yuhanna (John), as the first Maronite patriarch. The author of the Maronite book entitled *al-Huda (Nomocanon)* states that "the Maronite denomination is ascribed to John Marun, Patriarch of Great Antioch."[1] Likewise, the author of the book of the *Exposition of the Faith* writes: "In the name of God and by the power of the Trinity we begin this treatise on the faith of the holy church written at the Monastery of the holy and blessed John Marun who is the patriarch of the city of God Antioch and all the country of al-Sham and Syria."[2]

Neither source provides any concrete evidence that this John Marun was the first Maronite patriarch. Nor do they provide worthwhile information about Marun or the circumstances under which he allegedly became the first Maronite patriarch. Moreover, both sources are silent on how and when this John Marun became the "Patriarch of

Antioch" at a time when there were only two patriarchs of Antioch, the Chalcedonian or Malkite, and the anti-Chalcedonian or Monophysite patriarchs. While *al-Huda* indirectly refers to John Marun as "the Patriarch of Great Antioch," the *Exposition of the Faith* refers to him as "Patriarch of Antioch," after whom the Monastery of Marun was named. The impression we receive from this account is that John Marun was the founder of the monastery bearing his name, and that he was the patriarch of the city of Antioch, as well as all of Syria. The truth of the matter is that the translator of this source has distorted the original Syriac, giving the impression that the *Exposition of the Faith* was "written by the holy John Marun, Patriarch of Antioch, at the Monastery of Marun located on al-Asi River."[3] We may assume that the *Exposition of the Faith* does not belong to John Marun and that he was not its author.

In addition to these Maronite sources there are other references to this John Marun. One of these is made by Sa'id Ibn Batriq and the other by the Arab historian Abu al-Hasan al-Mas'udi. Both writers mention John Marun only in connection with the doctrine of Monothelitism. They refer to him as a monk and not as a patriarch. However, their accounts agree with *al-Huda* and the *Exposition of the Faith* on one essential point: that the Maronites received their name from this John, surnamed Marun, and not from the fifth-century ascetic Marun. These sources are explicit about this, and those Maronites who insist that their name derives from the fifth-century ascetic Marun or monastery presumably named after him contradict the very sources they cite to prove the origin of their church and community.

The Maronites began to discuss John Marun and his ascendency to the patriarchate at length in the fifteenth century. The first to do so was the Maronite Bishop Jabra'il al-Qila'i. The context of this bishop's story of John Marun is as follows. He relates that in 1495 a heated argument took place between himself and a Maronite priest, Jirjis Ibn Bishara, who had become a Syrian Orthodox "Jacobite," over the true origin of the Maronites and their name. As a result of this argument al-Qila'i wrote a book in refutation of the "Jacobite" doctrine. In this book he explains the origin of the Maronites and their perpetual adherence to the faith of Chalcedon. He also relates the life story of the seventh-century John Marun. Al-Qila'i claims that he derived this story from an ancient source written in Garshuni (Arabic written in Syriac script) at the Church of Our Lady in Damascus, but he provides no description of this source or any information about its author, contents, or how he happened to find it.[4]

According to al-Qilaʿi, John Marun was the son of a certain Agathon. In his boyhood Marun received a good education and was then sent to Constantinople to study Greek. He returned to Antioch where his faith was corrupted by the followers of Macarius, Monothelite patriarch of Antioch (656–681), and he embraced the Monothelite doctrine. He was ordained a bishop of Antioch but could not hold that see because Pope Honorius had already condemned it, as well as Patriarch Macarius, for holding the Monothelite doctrine. John remained in the Monothelite "heresy" and departed for the city of Tripoli. There he met the ambassador of Pope Honorius, who examined his faith and found him to be "orthodox." The ambassador took John to Rome, where his faith was again examined by a church council which found him to be of orthodox (Chalcedonian) faith. The pope then consecrated him a patriarch of Antioch; placing a mitre over his head, a staff in his hand, and a ring on his finger. John returned to Antioch and succeeded in obliterating the heresy of Macarius. Many "Jacobites" followed him and confessed the doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ and were thereafter referred to as Maronites. John then moved from Antioch to Lebanon, where he installed a cross by order of the pope as a symbol of the pope's authority. It was in Lebanon that he organized the Maronites as a separate group from the "Jacobites" and the Malkites and ordained for them metropolitans and bishops. Al-Qilaʿi continues to say that John's fame extended to remote countries and even to the Byzantine emperor, who wrote asking him to send three learned persons to teach him and his subjects the orthodox faith.[5] This, in brief, is the story al-Qilaʿi related of John Marun. Less than two centuries later this story was expanded by the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi.

According to al-Duwayhi, John was actually John of Serum (Serimin or Sirmium near Antioch), who later was called John Marun. He was the son of Agathon, the grandson of Elipides, and nephew of Prince Carlo Magno (Charlemagne), who came from France and conquered Antioch and all of Syria. John's mother was Anohamia, who, like her husband, was of noble origin. John was born in Antioch, where his grandfather and his father lived after Charlemagne occupied that city. John was educated in religious science as well as in the commentaries on the Scripture. He also mastered the Syriac language and pursued monastic life at the Monastery of Marun. After leaving the monastery he went to Constantinople to study the Greek language, Greek sciences, and the writings of the fathers of the church.[6] Al-Duwayhi continues to say that about this time (the middle of the seventh century) a heated argument took place between the defenders of the doctrine of Monothelitism and

their opponents. The disciples of Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, and his successor, Macarius, defended the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism) and were supported by the leading clergy of Constantinople. John Marun, on the other hand, defended the doctrine of two wills in Christ according to the faith of the Church of Rome. At this time, when the dispute over the one or two wills in Christ had reached its peak, the pope sent a cardinal to Antioch to publicize the doctrine of the two natures and two wills in Christ—the faith of the Church of Rome, Macarius, the Monothelite patriarch of Antioch, resided at that time in Constantinople and never returned to Antioch. It was at this time, too, that the Frankish Prince Eugene met with the Franks residing in Antioch and agreed to install a metropolitan, partisan to the Church of Rome, to teach the doctrine of the two wills in Christ. This metropolitan was John Marun, as the "Jacobites" testify in their book called *The Doctrine of the Jacobites*.[7] Al-Duwayhi provides the following quotation to support his point of view:

> Marun, then, stood up and agreed with the King of the Franks and said to him, "O King we fear that the Malkites might convert Lebanon to their faith [of one will in Christ]. Go to the Cardinal who is staying with you and force him to ordain me a metropolitan in order to keep some people in the Frankish faith [of two wills in Christ] and I will no more preach the doctrine of Jacob [Baradaeus]."[8]

The Doctrine of the Jacobites shall be discussed later. The least that could be said about this episode is that it is preposterous and historically groundless. Yet, al-Duwayhi seems to believe in its authenticity. He further states that in 676, the eighth year of the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, the cardinal ordained John a metropolitan for the Batrun in the district of Jubayl in Lebanon. Soon after John was ordained a metropolitan, he traveled from place to place preaching the true faith of the two wills in Christ, exhorting the people to live a righteous life. He was comforted by the fact that many who maintained the doctrine of one will in Christ were converted to the "true faith." In a short time, John Marun had a large following, spreading from Lebanon to Jerusalem and as far as Armenia. Al-Duwayhi concludes that Macarius, who persisted in his belief in the one will in Christ, was deposed by the Sixth Council, whereupon Theophanes was made a patriarch in his stead. When Theophanes died in 686 John Marun was chosen a patriarch of Antioch to succeed him.[9]

Al-Duwayhi states also that the Nestorian writer Abdisho, in the metric verse composed about Syriac writers and learned men, calls this

John Marun "John Bar Frangoye" (that is, John, son of the Franks). This, he alleges, demonstrates that John was of Frankish origin, that he was closely associated with the Franks, and that through their efforts he rose to the highest church offices.[10] Al-Duwayhi goes on to list the books which John Marun wrote, according to Abdisho's Catalogue. These books are: *On the Upbringing of Children, On Some Questions and Their Answers, On the Seven Eyes of the Lord, On Monastic Life, On the Exposition of the Mass Mentioned by Abraham Ecchellensis, Interpretations of Biblical Terms Mentioned by Bar Hebraeus in his Awsar Raze* (Storehouse of Secrets), *A Refutation of Nestorius and Peter the Fuller Regarding the Trisagion,* and *Two Treatises Proving the Doctrine of Two Natures and Two Wills in Christ.*[11] Al-Duwayhi's *History of the Maronite Denomination* (in manuscript form at the Maronite Monastery of Louisa in Aleppo) ascribes a different list of books to John Marun. Significant among these are a treatise on faith sent from the Monastery of Marun on al-Asi River to the inhabitants of Lebanon, and another one containing a refutation of heresies. Al-Duwayhi admits that he has not seen the letter but has guessed at its existence from several of Marun's testimonies proving that there are two natures and two wills in Christ, contrary to the doctrine held by the Byzantines in his time. He affirms that this treatise is the one Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, had used in order to spread "the tares of Monothelitism in Lebanon, a doctrine which he adopted from Sa'id Ibn Batriq who originated it."[12]

Al-Duwayhi claims that he found three treatises written by John Marun: one against Eutyches and Dioscorus on the doctrine of one nature in Christ; the second against Nestorius, who separated the person of the Logos from that of Christ; and the third against the phrase, *Thou who wast crucified for us*, added to the Trisagion.[13] Al-Duwayhi also claims that Abraham Ecchellensis was reported to have had a commentary on the statement of faith which the priest recited at his ordination, the other a commentary on the liturgy of Saint James.[14] Finally, erroneously calling him a Maronite, al-Duwayhi writes that the Nestorian Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib (d. 1043) relates, regarding those fathers who profess the faith of Nicea, that John entered the Monastery of Marun in the district of Hims and for this reason was called Marun. He adds that Ibn al-Tayyib also states that Marun's name was John and that his father was named Agathon, the son of Abdun.[15] Al-Duwayhi closes his lengthy account of John Marun by stating that many writers, whose testimonies he finds no need to repeat, have maintained that John was called John Marun after the Monastery of Marun where he lived as a monk.[16]

The episodes of both al-Qilaʿi and al-Duwayhi concerning the life and works of John Marun appear to be without historical foundation. Available sources mention nothing about a person named John Marun, the son of a Frankish father named Agathon, who was ordained a patriarch of Antioch by Pope Honorius. The question is where al-Qilaʿi obtained this tale about John Marun, his journey to Rome, and his ordination as patriarch by Pope Honorius, who conferred upon him a mitre, a staff, and a ring. Assemani suggests that al-Qilaʿi confused John Marun with Maronite Patriarch Irmia (Jeremiah) al-Amshiti, who went to Rome in 1215–1216 to profess his "catholic" faith.[17] Irmia's arrival in Rome coincided with the assemblage of the Fourth Lateran Council, which he was permitted to attend. When he returned to Lebanon in 1216, Pope Innocent III conferred on him the right to wear a mitre and a ring, indicating that he had become a prince of the Church of Rome. This indicates that since that date some relationship has been established between the Church of Rome and the Maronites of Lebanon. Al-Qilaʿi's story is made even more incredible by his use of anachronistic terms. One of them is the term "Prince" for Prince Eugene, a title not known in the Levant until the time of the Crusades. Another is his use of the term "Franks;" there were no "Franks" in Syria or Lebanon in the seventh century when John Marun allegedly lived there. Moreover, the popes had no ambassadors in Syria at that time, the office of cardinals had not yet been established, and the wearing of mitres by the dignitaries of the Church of Rome was not a church practice before the ninth century.[18] According to Assemani, Maronite bishops never wore the mitre and the ring before the beginning of the thirteenth century.[19] Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud observes that it is incredible that a man as great and prominent as Maronites claim him to be traveled from Antioch to Rome to undergo severe examination by a church council, and when found to be orthodox, was ordained by the pope. Dawud questions how all these events could have happened without being recorded by church historians or having been entered into the annals of the Church of Rome. He concludes that the whole episode of John Marun is a fabrication.[20]

According to al-Duwayhi, John Marun was a native of Serum (Seremis of Evagrius), a village in al-Suwaydiyya near Antioch, who later assumed the name Marun when he entered the monastery by this name.[21] He maintains that John of Serum defended the doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ as "the Jacobites themselves admit in the life story of their teacher Jacob Baradaeus."[22] To support his claim, al-Duwayhi quotes this "Jacobite" book written in Syriac.

> Then he [Jacob] stood up and preserved the faith of the Apostles which was handed down by James, first bishop of Jerusalem and filled the whole church with his beauties. Consequently, when members of the two parties, the orthodox and their opponents, the heretics met they would ask "who are you" and the orthodox would answer "we are of the faith of James the first of the Apostles, and brother of the Lord professed by this divine James [Jacob Baradaeus]" while their opponents would answer that they were of the faith of Ephraim of Amida or the Patriarch John the enemy of God.[23]

Al-Duwayhi explains this passage as meaning that those who believed in one nature and one will in Christ were partisans of Jacob Baradaeus who professed this faith, while those who professed two natures and two wills in Christ were partisans of Ephraim of Amida and John of Serum. John of Serum, al-Duwayhi alleges, was a monk at the Monastery of Marun, from which he received the name of Marun. He was a staunch opponent of the doctrine of one nature and one will in Christ professed by Baradaeus, and finally he became the "head of the Maronite nation."[24] In essence, al-Duwayhi is saying that from the sixth century, when Jacob Baradaeus revived the "Monophysite" doctrine of one nature of Christ, the Maronites were a religious group or party which opposed Jacob Baradaeus and professed the doctrine of two separate natures and wills in Christ.

Al-Duwayhi makes John Serum the successor of Ephraim of Amida, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch from 527 to 545, while in fact John of Serum was patriarch of Constantinople, not Antioch, from 566 to 597.[25] More incredible is the claim that John Marun was the same John of Serum who was notorious for his persecution of the anti-Chalcedonian party.[26] The point is how al-Duwayhi arrived at the conclusion that John Marun and John of Serum were the same person. The text he quotes of the life of James or Jacob Baradaeus mentions nothing about John Marun, and we must search for a clue to al-Duwayhi's identification of John Marun with John of Serum. On careful study of the Syriac text of the life of Jacob Baradaeus, published with English translation by E. W. Brooks, we find the same quotation previously produced by al-Duwayhi. Brooks claims this story to be the "Spurious Life of James," written by the famous Syrian historian, John of Ephesus.[27] That al-Duwayhi had used the original Syriac text which Brooks had translated into English is evidenced from the marginal note which appears on the same copy used by al-Duwayhi and which Brooks marks as *N*. In a footnote appended to the name of John of Serum, Brooks states that *N*

has the erroneous marginal note which states that "This is the Holy John Maro."[28] We do not know who added this marginal note, but he must have been a Maronite who tried to confuse John of Serum with John Marun in order to show that John Marun was a champion of the faith of Chalcedon and also to exonerate him from being a Monothelite "heretic." Here then is the source of al-Duwayhi's identification of John Marun with his namesake the patriarch of Constantinople.

Al-Duwayhi's description of John Marun as "the head of the Maronite nation" is untenable. If John Marun lived in the latter part of the seventh century, historical evidence indicates that during that period of time the Maronites were only a small religious group and not a "nation." Assemani, writing fifty years after al-Duwayhi, repeats the quotation of the latter produced from the Syriac "Life of James" (Jacob Baradaeus). What is puzzling about Assemani is that he tries to justify al-Duwayhi's opinion by reaching a different conclusion. He states that the author of the life of Jacob Baradaeus meant that John of Serum was the same John Marun and not John of Serum, the patriarch of Constantinople. He argues that it was not reported that John of Serum ever debated with the inhabitants of Syria and Lebanon on matters of the faith, nor was his name known to them. Assemani claims also that calling James the first of the Apostles is contrary to the tradition of the "Jacobite" Church which maintains that Peter, not James, was the head of the Apostles. This, Assemani asserts, is evident from "Jacobite" prayer books and rituals. Moreover, he goes on to say that the "Jacobites" did not recognize the church of Jerusalem as the first patriarchate of the Apostle James but that they call it the mother of all churches, as is evident from their use of the liturgy of Saint James.[29] This comment by Assemani is most surprising since it could not be attributed to his misunderstanding of the Syriac text of the life of Jacob Baradaeus. This text explicitly mentions John of Serum with a marginal note interpolated by a Maronite writer, explaining that John of Serum was Marun. Certainly the author never meant John Marun when he discussed John of Serum, yet Maronites still maintain that John Marun and John of Serum were the same person.[30] By the same token, the attempt of Maronite priest Daww to qualify Seremis as the native village of John Marun lacks historical validity.[31] It contradicts al-Duwayhi's claim that John Marun was born in Antioch and that he was of Frankish origin.

On consulting the genealogy of John Marun, we find that al-Duwayhi makes him a nephew of Emperor Charlemagne (742–814), while stating that Marun became a "Patriarch of Antioch" in 686, fifty-six years before Charlemagne was born.[32]

In his attempt to substantiate the origin of John Marun, his faith, and his elevation to the office of a metropolitan (allegedly by a cardinal who was residing in Syria), al-Duwayhi relied on a fifteenth-century source compiled in Arabic in defense of the (Monophysite) doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*, which al-Duwayhi calls the "Book of the Doctrine of the Jacobites."[33] The compiler of this book, a learned man of the Syrian Orthodox faith, Musa Ibn Atsha states that Marun stood up and told the Frankish king, who was in Antioch, to ask the cardinal who was on a visit to that city, to ordain him a metropolitan in order to save the inhabitants of Lebanon from becoming Malkites, thereupon holding the doctrine of one will in Christ. What Ibn Atsha attempts to say is that John Marun was a believer in two wills in Christ, and his appeal to the Frankish king to prevail on the cardinal to ordain a metropolitan was to save the people of Lebanon from becoming converts to the doctrine of one will in Christ, that is, from becoming "heretics." However, from this appeal of John Marun to the king we discover, interestingly, that Marun was a follower of Jacob Baradaeus and an adherent to the doctrine of one nature and one will in Christ. Here are Ibn Atsha's exact words:

> When the King of the Rum [Byzantine emperor] inflicted the Syrians with calamities and killed them, Marun stood up and joined ranks with the King of the Franks whose name was Prince Eugene. He told them, "O King, we are afraid that the Malkite nation might attract the inhabitants of Lebanon and convert them to their faith. So tell the Cardinal who is with you and force him to ordain me a metropolitan in order to retain some people in the Frankish faith. As to the belief [doctrine] of Jacob Baradaeus I shall no more preach it." He [the Cardinal] then consecrated him a metropolitan for al-Batrun.[34]

John Marun's deal with the cardinal is very clear. The cardinal agreed to ordain him a metropolitan; in return John Marun would no longer preach or mention the doctrine of Jacob Baradaeus, that is, *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. In addition, after his ordination Marun would profess the "Frankish faith" of two natures and two wills in Christ in order to stop the inhabitants of Lebanon from being converted to the faith of the Malkites, who prior to the Sixth Council were Monothelites. It should be noted that the compiler of this book does not say when the alleged cardinal ordained John Marun a metropolitan; however, al-Duwayhi asserts that he was ordained a metropolitan in the year 676.[35] While al-Duwayhi does not identify the cardinal who ordained John

Marun a metropolitan, Assemani explains that it was Bishop John of Philadelphia (present-day Amman in Jordan) in compliance with a request of the "Catholic" inhabitants of Antioch and Lebanon.[36]

In the aftermath of the Monothelite controversy and the Lateran Council in 649, Pope Martin I, who became pope on July 5 of that year, sent letters to the Chalcedonian churches of Africa, Antioch, and Jerusalem, informing them of the acts of the Lateran Council and of the condemnation of Monothelitism, the *Ecthesis* of Emperor Heraclius, and the *Typus* of Constans II. Martin exhorted the churches to adhere to the "orthodox faith."[37] He also appointed Bishop John of Philadelphia, on recommendation of Stephen of Dor and the eastern Chalcedonian monks, to be his vicar in the East. The pope empowered Bishop John to bring order to the Chalcedonian churches of the East and to appoint bishops, priests, and deacons within the dioceses of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, In order to enable him to promulgate the "true faith," the pope provided John of Philadelphia with the acts of the council and an encyclical.[38] The pope also wrote to a number of bishops (including Theodore of Esbus, bishop of a parish belonging to the province of Arabia) asking them to obey Bishop John and help accomplish his mission.[39] The editors of the *Sacrosancta Concilia*, who record the documents relating to Bishop John's mission, say nothing indicating that John of Philadelphia ordained a metropolitan named John Marun for the Batrun diocese in the district of Jubayl in Lebanon. Such an ordination is most unlikely, considering the time that had lapsed between the end of Bishop John's mission in the East and his alleged ordination of John Marun to the office of metropolitan. This surely contradicts the claims of both al-Duwayhi and Assemani that John Marun was ordained a metropolitan in 676.[40] This date, set by al-Duwayhi and accepted by Assemani, also contradicts the claim of fifteenth-century Maronite Bishop al-Qilaʿi, who asserts that John Marun was ordained a bishop of Antioch, without a diocese, and was later consecrated a patriarch of Antioch by Pope Honorius. But Honorius died in 638, indicating that John Marun must have been a bishop before this date. Al-Duwayhi recognizes the discrepancy of this date and blames it on the copyist, whom he claims transcribed the name of Sergius in place of Honorius. Al-Duwayhi means Pope Sergius I (687–701), whose vicar in the East allegedly took John Marun to Rome. According to al-Duwayhi, Pope Sergius welcomed John Marun because he, too, was a native of Antioch. It was Sergius I, al-Duwayhi asserts, who consecrated John Marun patriarch of Antioch.[41] In 676 when the ordination of John Marun presumably took place, the pope of Rome was either Adeodat (672–676) or his successor,

Donus (676–678). There is no evidence that there was a vicar or a legate representing either pope in the East. The only pope who had a delegate in the East was Pope Martin I (d. 655); his delegate was Bishop John of Philadelphia, who arrived in the East in 649 as noted above.

There is, however, no historical evidence to support the idea that Bishop John remained in the East for twenty-seven years, long enough to ordain John Marun a metropolitan. Furthermore, the annals of the Church of Rome mention nothing about the mission of John of Philadelphia after the death of Pope Martin I, who sent him to the East. At least four popes succeeded Martin I, and at least one of them must have contacted the papal delegate in the East. More incredible is the claim that John of Philadelphia ordained John Marun a metropolitan. The main purpose of John of Philadelphia was to bring an end to the Monothelite controversy which was disrupting the Chalcedonian Sees of Antioch and Jerusalem and to install, in higher offices, clergymen who would uphold the doctrine of two wills in Christ. All the available evidence about John Marun during this period refers to him as a Monothelite, not a believer in the two wills in Christ, or a "Catholic." The Monothelitism of John Marun is confirmed in *The Doctrine of the Jacobites,* the very source Maronites cite to establish the "true" identity of John Marun.[42]

Al-Duwayhi also maintains that Abdisho (d. 1318) refers to John Marun in one of his *mymre* (poems) as "John bar Frangoye," (John, son of the Franks). Actually, al-Duwayhi is citing the *Catalogue of Books* compiled by Nestorian writer Abdisho Bar Brikha, better known as al-Subawi. This catalogue was published in 1653 in Rome, and was edited by Ibrahim al-Haqillani (Abraham Ecchellensis), a Maronite.[43] Assemani feels that al-Duwayhi erred in considering John Frangoye as John Marun and maintains that the John of Abdisho was not John Bar Frangoye but John Bar Finkhoye (son of the Potters) and not John Marun.[44] Obviously, al-Duwayhi was misled by Ecchellensis who, while editing Abdisho's *Catalogue* and to prove the identity of John Marun, must have distorted the name of Nestorian writer John Finkhoye (son of the Potters) into John Frangoye (John, son of the Franks), the two terms being similar in Syriac.[45] On discovering the "true" identity of John through Ecchellensis's distortion, al-Duwayhi is bold enough to state that John Marun was of Frankish origin, that he had strong associations with the Franks in Syria, and through their efforts rose to the highest church offices.[46] With the same boldness, he cites the books listed in Abdisho's

Catalogue as authored by John Bar Finkhoye and considers them to be the works of John Marun.

Al-Duwayhi also claims that Bar Hebraeus, in his *Awsar Raze (Storehouse of Secrets),* discussed a certain "Yuhanna (John) Marun" (that is, John of Marun, or more correctly, John who belonged to the Monastery of Marun) and that this John is John Marun of the Maronites.[47] Assemani again shows that al-Duwayhi erred and that the John Marun of Bar Hebraeus is a tenth-century Syrian writer.[48] Despite Assemani's correction of al-Dawayhi, a later author of the same surname, Istefan Awwad (Evodius) Assemani (1711–1782), insists on repeating al-Duwayhi's mistake in identifying the John Marun of Bar Hebraeus with the John Marun Maronites claim to be their first patriarch.[49]

The activities of John Marun after his alleged ordination as bishop and later a patriarch were further related by al-Duwayhi and Assemani, who followed his every footstep. Both writers claim that after his ordination John Marun left the Monastery of Marun and went to Phoenicia, his new diocese. He labored in the vineyard of the Lord and converted many people from the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism) to the "true faith" of two wills in Christ. In time, his following increased and spread as far as Armenia and Jerusalem. For the large number of people who embraced his teaching, he ordained bishops and priests and appointed army commanders, among them his nephew Ibrahim. [50] Now if we interpret al-Duwayhi and Assemani correctly, we receive the impression that the followers of John Marun became numerous to the point of forming a "nation" with its own religious and military organizations. This new nation is the "Maronite Nation." It may be a bit of a shock to learn that the Maronites became a "nation" in the late seventh or eighth century, if one considers the fact that Maronites claim that John Marun died in 707; there is no historical evidence, however, to support their claim. The impact of the shock is weakened when one realizes that al-Duwayhi, Assemani, and in fact, the Maronites until today, confuse the Maronites with the Mardaites, a warlike people of obscure origin who first appeared in the Middle East in the seventh century. We shall see later that the Maronites cite the accounts of Theophanes and other chroniclers in support of the theory that the Mardaites and the Maronites are one and the same people, or as they claim, "one nation."[51]

16

John Marun

Was He a Patriarch of Antioch?

According to Maronite sources, John Marun, who had been bishop since 676, was elevated to the patriarchal throne of Antioch, succeeding the Chalcedonian patriarch Theophanes, (d. 687). Al-Duwayhi relates that when Theophanes died, Pope Conon (686–687), without consulting the Roman clergy, installed in his place Constantine, a deacon from the church of Syracuse. Constantine not only abused his office but also created disruption among the people. This prompted the pope to send orders for the emperor's agents in Antioch to arrest constantine and imprison him. the pope then wrote to the clergy of Antioch to choose a patriarch in his place. The clergy met and chose John Marun as their new patriarch to succeed Theophanes.[1]

A Malkite Priest Yuhanna Ujaymi claims that John Marun was ordained bishop of the Batrun diocese by Macarius, the Monothelite patriarch of Antioch, to protect the interest of the Monothelites. Ujaymi also states that John Marun took advantage of his ordination as bishop to declare himself not patriarch of Antioch but patriarch of the Maronites.[2] Ujaymi's account has no historical foundation.

If we examine the history of this period, we discover that the Chalcedonian or Malkite patriarchs had resided in Constantinople since 640, because most of them were Monothelites holding the same faith as that of Emperor Heraclius. By the middle of the seventh century Syria had

been occupied by the Arabs, and possibly these patriarchs fell into disfavor because of their association with Heraclius and the Byzantine state. Theophanes became patriarch in 681, but it is not certain whether he remained in Constantinople or returned to Antioch. He did, however, attend the fourteenth session of the Sixth Council held in May 681, and assisted in the examination of the authenticity of the acts of the Fifth Council.[3] There is no mention in available historical sources that John Marun succeeded Theophanes to the Malkite See of Antioch. Al-Duwayhi, asserting that the clergy of Antioch chose Bishop John Marun and "ordained him a Patriarch to succeed Theophanes," contradicts himself by stating that Pope Honorius consecrated John Marun as patriarch. To support his point, al-Duwayhi informs us that he has relied on "an ancient story" but does not reveal his source. According to this "ancient story," John Marun went to Antioch, where he engaged in heated debate with the followers of Macarius, the "heretical" patriarch of Antioch. As a result of this debate, John Marun embraced the "heresy" of Macarius (Monothelitism) and confessed that in Christ there was but one nature, and that Christ had no rational soul because His divinity had taken its place. What al-Duwayhi is attempting to say is that John Marun adopted the doctrine of Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (d. 390), which contained the idea that the divinity of Christ had taken the place of His rational soul, an idea for which Apollinaris was condemned. In other words, John Marun had become an Apollinarian Monophysite. Then he became a bishop of Antioch but without a given parish because, as al-Duwayhi asserts, Pope "Abagrio" had already condemned Macarius and the See of Antioch. Al-Duwayhi continues this "ancient story" by stating that from Antioch John Marun went to Tripoli, where he met by chance the legate of Pope Honorius and discussed with him matters concerning the faith. The papal legate took Marun to Rome where, his faith was examined by a council of bishops and found to be "orthodox." The pope then consecrated him a patriarch of Antioch and conferred on him a mitre, a ring, and a staff.[4]

Although al-Duwayhi does not identify this "ancient story," we know that he copied it from the account of the Maronite Bishop Jabra'il al-Qila'i (d. 1516). We have shown previously that al-Qila'i claimed that he derived this story from the Garshuni manuscript at the Church of Our Lady in Damascus. Al-Duwayhi copied it without citing the Garshuni manuscript as his source. However, al-Duwayhi reproduces it once more in another work but gives the impression that he derived it from a source other than al-Qila'i, but again he does not identify it. He makes one

qualification regarding the name "Abagrio," which he contends is a copyist's mistake for "Agathon," the name of the pope through whose efforts the Sixth Council was convened.[5]

The contradictions in al-Duwayhi's accounts of John Marun are obvious. Relying on the book which he calls *The Doctrine of the Jacobites,* he makes Marun a bishop of the Batrun in Lebanon, while elsewhere, he styles him a bishop of Antioch. Again, in one work he claims that the clergy of Antioch elected Marun and consecrated him in that office, although he claims that the copyist of the manuscript mistook Honorius for Sergius.[6]

Assemani, who follows in the footsteps of al-Duwayhi, writes that in his account of the ordination of John Marun as patriarch, al-Duwayhi relied on the tradition generally accepted by Maronites that is stated in *The Doctrine of the Jacobites,* and on the introduction of John Marun to his book, *Exposition of the Faith*, Assemani does not approve of al-Duwayhi's opinion that John Marun was consecrated a patriarch by the clergy or a clergy council of Antioch. He argues that if John Marun were chosen for the patriarchal office by the clergy of Antioch, Latin and Byzantine historians would have mentioned his name in the list of the patriarchs of Antioch, whether he was "heretic" (Monothelite) or orthodox. While this argument of Assemani sounds logical, he confronts us with another opinion which lacks historical substantiation. While he states that it is unlikely that the clergy of Antioch, subservient as they were to Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus (685–695), were the ones who elected John Marun and consecrated him a patriarch of Antioch, he asserts that John Marun was elected a patriarch by the "bishops of the Mardaites, who were no other than the Maronites' bishops themselves." He believes that this confirms the practice of the Maronites of choosing their patriarchs separately from the Malkites, the "Jacobites," and the Nestorians. To justify his point, Assemani contends that it is incredible that such a great number of people (meaning the Mardaites) "who are the Maronites" who had occupied a country extending from the Black Mountain to Jerusalem and who possessed distinctive customs, laws, and rituals could have been without a leader or authority. And since the activities of John Marun, including his consecration as patriarch, took place in Lebanon, both Latin and Byzantine historians had no way of recording them. Assemani concludes with the opinion that the episode related by P. Francisco Quaresmio in his biography of John Marun, asserting that Marun was taken to Rome to be ordained patriarch of Antioch by Pope Sergius, is based on the belief that, unlike the rest of the

Syrians, John Marun and the Maronites had perpetually adhered to the Apostolic See of Rome.[7]

Assemani leaves no room for doubt that John Marun became a patriarch of Antioch and seems to have accepted the episode related by al-Duwayhi about John Marun as truthful. He differs with al-Duwayhi, however, on the point of who ordained John Marun patriarch. Like al-Duwayhi, who invented a new epithet for John Marun and considered him to be one with John of Serum, Assemani creates new bishops whom he calls the "bishops of the Mardaites or Marada," claiming that they ordained John Marun patriarch.[8] But what is Assemani's source? It is the unreliable biography of John Marun written by al-Qilaʿi and sent to the priest Jirjis Bishara in 1495. This biography was translated into Latin by Quaresmio and was published in 1634.[9] Assemani's other source is al-Duwayhi. Using the previous argument by Assemani, one may observe that if the bishops of the Mardaites, whom Assemani claims to be the Maronites, had ordained John Marun a patriarch of Antioch, certainly Latin and Byzantine sources would mention such a solemn event, and church historians would have counted him among the patriarchs of Antioch. Indeed, we find no mention of this John Marun, either as a bishop or as a patriarch, except in Maronite sources, beginning with al-Qilaʿi in the latter part of the fifteenth century, which are without historical foundation. One point worth mentioning is that while al-Duwayhi states that John Marun succeeded Theophanes to the patriarchal throne of Antioch in 686, Assemani asserts that he was elected a patriarch by the Mardaites bishops in 685, the year in which Theophanes died; according to Asad Rustam, a contemporary Rum (Byzantine) writer, Theophanes died in 687.[10]

Assemani sheds further light on the reasons which led to the election of John Marun as a patriarch of Antioch by the Mardaites or, as Assemani calls them, the Maronite bishops. In his *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis Canonici et Civilis*, he states that during the time when the Mardaites (Maronites) controlled all the country from Antioch to Jerusalem, their bishops were dissatisfied with "Monothelite heretical" patriarchs such as Macedonius, Gregorius, and Macarius occupying the See of Antioch, particularly when they had been chosen by a "heretical Monothelite" emperor. For this reason, after the death of the legitimate Patriarch Theophanes in 685, the Mardaites' bishops chose John Marun to succeed him as patriarch, with the approval of John, bishop of Philadelphia, the papal delegate to the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem.[11]

Reference has already been made to the mission of this John, bishop of Philadelphia, who did not remain in the East until 685 in order to approve the ordination of John Marun as patriarch. The point Assemani makes with such apparent authority is that the Mardaite bishops became discontented with the "heretical Monothelite" patriarchs' rule of the See of Antioch and decided to elect an "orthodox," (a person who believed in two wills in Christ) as their patriarch; their choice was John Marun. What Assemani attempts to affirm is that these Mardaite (Maronite) bishops chose to have a patriarch of their own for specifically religious reasons. This patriarch would hold the same belief they maintained, that is, two wills and not one will in Christ, which is the faith upheld by the Church of Rome. These "orthodox" bishops became so displeased with the Monothelite (one will in Christ) "heresy" which had infested the See of Antioch that they wanted to have their own patriarch, with the approval of the Church of Rome through the papal delegate to the East—John, bishop of Philadelphia. In sum, Monothelitism was the only reason which motivated these bishops to elect John Marun patriarch. Yet, under the direction of Assemani, the Maronite Lebanese Council assembled in Lebanon in 1736 resolved that it was for purely secular and not religious reasons that the Maronites founded their patriarchate.[12] The members of the council, including Assemani, alleged that the continuous conflict between the Malkites and the Maronites was what finally prompted the latter to separate themselves from the former and to install their own patriarchs. Consequently, those who followed the Byzantine emperor (Malko in Syriac) were called Malkites (the emperor's partisans), and those who rebelled against the emperor and threw off his yoke were called Mardaites or Marada (rebels). These Mardaites, claim the council members, were later called Maronites.[13]

Assemani's assumption appears to be that both the Malkites and the Maronites were adherents to the faith of Chalcedon, but after several Malkite patriarchs adopted the Monothelite heresy, so much against the faith defined by Chalcedon, the Maronites took advantage of the death of Patriarch Theophanes in 685 and installed their own patriarch to succeed him. There is no evidence, however, to prove that Theophanes had embraced the Monothelite doctrine. It is surprising that the so-called Mardaite (Maronite) bishops waited so long to install a non-Monothelite patriarch when they knew that Monothelitism had long since penetrated the Chalcedonian patriarchate of Antioch, since it had begun in 629–630 when Emperor Heraclius imposed this doctrine on the church in Syria, resulting in its adoption by the monks of the Monastery of Marun. There was no reason for the Mardaite (Maronite) bish-

ops to consider the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism) a heresy, when they themselves were Monothelites. Furthermore, it is hard to believe that a council of bishops meeting to elect a patriarch failed to have its meeting, procedures, and resolutions recorded in the annals of the Maronite Church or any other church. Consequently, we may deduce that these assumptions made by Assemani and other Maronites are historically groundless. Turning again to Tal Mahri's account, the first to relate that the monks of the Monastery of Marun installed their first patriarch from their own ranks in 745, we discover that there is nothing to substantiate this event. Tal Mahri, himself a patriarch of Antioch and a learned man well versed in the canons of the church, certainly would have referred to such a council and would have mentioned that John Marun succeeded Theophanes to the Chalcedonian patriarchal See of Antioch, if it were true. Tal Mahri, of course, knew that the Malkites or Chalcedonian patriarchate of Antioch was the only patriarchate in the eighth century which contested its claim to the See of Antioch with the anti-Chalcedonian or Monophysite segment of that patriarchate of which Tal Mahri and his predecessors were patriarchs. If a "Maronite" patriarchate existed at that time, it is most astonishing that historical sources are dead silent about its founding, activities, affairs, and patriarchs. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud rightfully observes in this context that, despite the effort al-Duwayhi expended on his biographies of Maronite patriarchs, he was unable to produce with certainty any information about the early "Maronite" patriarchs prior to Patriarch Yusuf al-Jirjisi at the end of the eleventh (more correctly the twelfth) century. As to the period prior to the twelfth century, Dawud asserts that al-Duwayhi was only able to conjecture the names of twenty-two patriarchs but provides no evidence about their lives and activities.[14] It is interesting that al-Duwayhi entertained strong doubts about the identity of at least fourteen of these patriarchs. After mentioning the names of these patriarchs, al-Duwayhi states that he doubts their identity for two reasons. First, the Maronite rite is so similar to the rite of the "Jacobites" that he admits that these patriarchs were "Jacobites." Second, one of these patriarchs were called Yeshue, a name he believes was not common among the Maronites but was among the "Jacobites" Syrian orthodox.[15] However, al-Duwayhi writes that when he obtained a list of the names of patriarchs from the Syrian Orthodox churches in Aleppo and Damascus he could not find the names of these patriarchs listed and concluded that they must have been "from our Maronite nation."[16] In fact, we have no information of any historical worth about early Maronite patriarchs until the thirteenth century, when Irmia al-Amshiti was consecrated a

patriarch in the Monastery of Our Lady at Yanuh.[17] The names of the patriarchs al-Duwayhi mentions before this century appear to be fictitious.

The Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs offers no new information on these questions, but rather iterates the former views of how John Marun became a patriarch, concluding that all these views are possible. He remarks that although Assemani was not positive about the former views and could not produce conclusive evidence that John Marun did become a patriarch, there is no reason to detract from Assemani's views on the patriarchate of John Marun simply because the Byzantine and Latin historians were silent on the matter. Like al-Duwayhi and Assemani, al-Dibs argues that it is incredible that a valiant people like the Marada (Maronites), who occupied the entire country from Antioch to Jerusalem, could have remained without a patriarchate. With a divergent view, however, al-Dibs cites Pope Benedict XIV in support of the claim that the Maronites did have a patriarch and that he was confirmed by the Roman pontiff. He states that in addressing the cardinals on July 13, 1744, this pope told them: "Do not forget that when the Monothelite heresy spread at the end of the seventh century and corrupted the subjects of the Patriarchate of Antioch, the Maronites, in order to keep their denomination intact, determined to choose their own patriarch to be confirmed by the Roman Pontiff."[18] Al-Dibs notes that the writers who recorded these events "unanimously mention that the patriarch the Maronites chose was John Marun."[19]

Pope Benedict XIV was not a meticulous historian who could be expected to verify and document his sources. As head of the Church of Rome, Benedict desired the complete union of the Maronites with the Apostolic See of Rome, and a few complimentary words would certainly ameliorate the attitude of the Maronites, who, since the sixteenth century when Maronite students first came to Rome, had attempted to establish the authenticity of their church and community. It is surprising that al-Dibs cites the pope as his authority while Assemani, who was much more learned in the history of the popes and the Church of Rome, did not cite these popes to prove the origin of the Maronite church and community. Moreover, in his speech Pope Benedict XIV did not mention the name of the person the Maronites elected as their first patriarch. In fact, the pretext of the "Monothelite heresy," which he offers as his reason for choosing this patriarch, contradicts the above-mentioned statement of the Maronite Lebanese Council that the Maronites elected their first patriarch for secular and not for religious reasons. In making this

statement Pope Benedict must have been influenced by the Maronite students in Rome whose intention, as Bishop Clement Dawud writes, was to "distort historical truth in order to substantiate their own claims."[20]

Maronites claim that when Theophanes died he was succeeded by John Marun, who became the first patriarch of the Maronites. The reason they offer is that the Chalcedonian Malkite patriarchs were residing in Constantinople and Theophanes's death left the Chalcedonian See of Antioch vacant. This requires some elucidation of church canons. According to church canons confirmed by the different church councils, especially the first three ecumenical councils, no bishop had the right to ordain a cleric from his diocese without the approval of his superior. This practice was meant to prevent total chaos and disorder in the spiritual jurisdiction of the different churches and their clerics. The point is that claiming that John, bishop of Philadelphia, had the power to ordain clerics of all ranks for the Chalcedonian patriarchate of Antioch was sheer violation of church canons and practice; the Church of Rome had no jurisdiction over the Church of Antioch. The sixth canon of the Council of Nicea (325) confirmed the ancient usage of delineating and respecting the spiritual jurisdiction of the chief bishops in ecclesiastical government. Consequently, the validity of the ordination of John Marun as a patriarch by a council of bishops or by a pope could only be judged in conformity with the fourth canon of the same Council of Nicea, which required that the transactions of bishops in every province must be confirmed by the metropolitan bishop.[21] Be that as it may, there is no evidence to support the opinion of Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs that the "legitimate and 'Catholic' successor of Theophanes was John Marun, who was installed a patriarch of Antioch by the Sixth Council."[22] The mere fact that the Chalcedonian See of Antioch was vacant, as al-Dibs alleges, does not empower another religious group, in this case the Maronites, to install a patriarch to that see. Despite the fact that the Malkite patriarchal See of Antioch was vacant several times, the Malkite community and hierarchy managed to install their own patriarchs and have perpetuated their line of patriarchs to this day.

The Maronites' claim raises the question of who the legitimate contenders were for the See of Antioch. From church history we learn that the See of Antioch was ruled by one patriarch until early in the sixth century. After 451, the Church of Antioch was split into two groups, one Chalcedonian and the other anti-Chalcedonian. However, the situation changed when Severus of Antioch became patriarch in 512. This formidable man fell into disfavor when Justin I assumed the purple. A Latin

by origin, Justin was a staunch proponent of the Council of Chalcedon and naturally detested Severus of Antioch, a staunch opponent of the same council. The hatred of the emperor towards Severus was transformed into open hostility and vindictiveness. Both Justin and his army commander Vitalian sought to kill Severus. Threatened with having his tongue cut off, Severus was forced to flee to Egypt in 518, and the See of Antioch was filled after him by a Chalcedonian appointee of the emperor.[23] However, in the eyes of the majority of Syrians he was their lawful patriarch. The death of Justin I in 527 and the accession to the throne of his nephew Justinian I did not change the situation of the patriarchate of Antioch. A Chalcedonian like his predecessor, Justinian I wavered in his attempt to reconcile the Chalcedonians with their opponents. While it is true that he invited Severus of Antioch and other anti-Chalcedonian church fathers to Constantinople to discuss the unity of the churches, for all intents and purposes he was determined to uphold the definition of faith of Chalcedon as the "only acceptable" one, but Severus vehemently rejected it. From 518, when he was forced out of office, until his death in 538, Severus never stopped administering the Church of Antioch from his place of voluntary exile in Egypt. During this period three Chalcedonian patriarchs—Paul the "Jew," Euphrasius, and Ephraim of Amida—sat on the throne of Antioch, but to the anti-Chalcedonian party Severus was still the legitimate patriarch of Antioch. After his death the members of his party, which formed the majority of the Syrians, elected Sergius as his successor. The patriarchate of Antioch was now contested by the Chalcedonians and their opponents. The Maronites did not appear on the scene until the year 745, when the monks of the Monastery of Marun first installed a patriarch from their monastery. Furthermore, there is no evidence that early Maronite patriarchs called themselves "patriarchs of Antioch." Indeed, not until the middle of the thirteenth century (1256) did Pope Alexander IV permit the Maronite Shimʿun (Simon) to style himself as the "Patriarch of Antioch."[24] The succeeding popes never used this epithet for the Maronite patriarchs but simply referred to them as the Maronite patriarchs. Not until the eighteenth century did the popes, particularly Benedict XIV, finally establish the practice of calling the Maronite patriarchs "Patriarchs of Antioch."[25]

We have already discussed the story of John Marun as related by al-Qilaʿi and expanded by Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi. Al-Qilaʿi, however, does not elaborate on John Marun's career after his return to Antioch from Rome; he only relates that in Rome the pope ordained Marun a

patriarch and conferred on him the pallium, admonishing him to beware of the Malkites, the "Jacobites," and the Copts. In this account the pope also told John Marun to heed his counsel and Mount Lebanon would eventually be under his jurisdiction. Al-Qilaʿi concludes that the "elect one," John Marun, died in Kfarhayy.[26] The rest of the story is left to the fertile imagination of al-Duwayhi for further embellishment. We shall see shortly that Marun was possessed by a demon and that he was stoned in Kfarhayy.

According to al-Duwayhi, John Marun returned to Antioch after swearing allegiance to the Church of Rome. He began to teach the "true faith" and to convert those who had gone astray. By the "true faith" al-Duwayhi means the belief in two natures and two wills in Christ as defined by the Council of Chalcedon and upheld by the Church of Rome. In other words, what al-Duwayhi intends is that John Marun was not a Monothelite "heretic" teaching the doctrine of one will in Christ, a doctrine condemned by the Church of Rome. Al-Duwayhi goes onto say that when the news of John Marun's preaching of the "true faith" reached Constantinople, the Monothelite bishops in that city instigated Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, to force Pope Sergius and John Marun to observe the doctrine and canons of the Monothelites. In other words, they attempted to force them to accept the Monothelite "heresy." When the pope and John Marun refused to comply with the Monothelite "heresy" and Monothelite canons, or renounce the doctrine of two wills in Christ, the emperor threatened to send them into exile. However, the pope and John Marun remained adamant in resisting the emperor's order. The emperor then sent his army commanders Zachariah and Leo to bring back the pope and John Marun in chains.[28] When John Marun learned that his life was in danger he fled to the Monastery of Marun on al-Asi (Orontes) River near Apamea and there wrote a treatise on faith which he sent to the people of Lebanon. In the meantime, the emperor sent his commanders to Lebanon to capture John Marun and bring him to the capital in chains. One of these commanders, Leo, hesitated to do so, apologizing and explaining that John Marun was held in high esteem by the Lebanese and that they would never allow him to be taken. The emperor became furious and threw Leo into prison, then sent two more commanders, Maurice and Maurician, to capture John Marun. To alleviate the fear of the Lebanese, the emperor spread the rumor that his purpose for sending the army into Syria was not to capture John Marun but to fight against the Arabs. John Marun was not deceived by the emperor's trick, however, and asked his nephew Ibrahim to provide him

with valiant men to fight for him. In a short time Ibrahim was able to marshall twelve thousand armed men and moved John Marun from Antioch to Samar Jubayl in Lebanon.[29]

In the summer of 694, Maurice and Maurician arrived in Syria and attacked the Monastery of Marun, killing five hundred of its monks and destroying its building. Then they attacked other places such as Qinnesrin and the frontier towns, ravaging, destroying, and killing by the sword the followers of Patriarch John Marun. When the Byzantine army marched against Lebanon the news of its movement sent a wave of fright among the people.[30] In the meantime, the commander, Leo, managed to escape from prison, arrested Emperor Justinian Rhinotmetus, cut off his nose, and declared himself emperor. The first act of the new emperor was to permit John Marun and the governor of Lebanon, Simʿan, to counterattack the invading Byzantine army at a place called Amiun, where they killed many warriors and chased away the rest.[31] For the battle that ensued at Amiun and the encounter of the Lebanese with the Byzantine army, al-Duwayhi quotes as evidence the book which he calls *The Doctrine of the Jacobites*. According to this book:

> When the Malkites, meaning the Byzantines, reached the village of Amiun, Muwayrin [a diminutive of Marun used here in a derogatory sense] and his nephew Burayhim [a diminutive of Ibrahim used here in a derogatory sense] separated themselves from the Malkites and went to Samar Jubayl to protect its inhabitants from the poll-tax imposed by the Malkites on those who refused to accept their faith. Then all the Syrians and the inhabitants of the Mountains of Kisrawan and Lebanon followed Marun. This happened in the time of Severus, patriarch of Antioch and all the East.[32]

Al-Duwayhi comments on this episode by stating that because of this attack against John Marun and the war between the Lebanese and the Byzantines which culminated in the battle of Amiun, the separation of the Maronites and the Malkites became final. In sum, al-Duwayhi says that those who attached themselves to the Byzantines and confessed one will in Christ were called Malkites, that is, partisans of the Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, who held this same doctrine of one will (Monothelitism). Those who remained steadfast in the faith held by John Marun, that is, two wills in Christ, and were obedient to him were called Maronites.[33] Al-Duwayhi seems to overlook the fact that according to *The Doctrine of the Jacobites* the battle of Amiun allegedly happened in the time of the Emperor Justinian I (483–565), not in the time of Justinian II (669–711). Moreover, the author of the *Doctrine of the Jaco-*

bites states that this event took place in the time of Severus, patriarch of Antioch (d. 538), before Severus fled to Egypt in 518, and this battle must have occurred before this date. Indeed the whole episode is historically groundless.

The previous story is recorded by al-Duwayhi in the tenth chapter of his book on the *History of the Maronite Denomination.* In the eleventh chapter the author adds more events to his narrative. He states that after commanders Maurice and Maurician destroyed the Monastery of Marun, Patriarch John Marun built another east of the village of Kfarhayy in the Batrun district and transferred the skull of the fifth-century ascetic Marun to that location.[34] John Marun also fixed January 5 as the commemoration day of the earlier ascetic, with the intention that the name of "this distinguished saint" should be known all over Syria. Al-Duwayhi continues: "John Marun found it appropriate that the people of those regions should call themselves Maronites in honor of this man [the fifth century ascetic Marun]."[35] Al-Duwayhi adds that in 694, the year of the Byzantine campaign against the Lebanese, the Arab armies attacked north Africa. Commander Leo sent his army by sea to repel the Arabs, but his army was defeated and shamefully returned to Constantinople. Fearing that the emperor might censure them for their defeat, the Byzantine soldiers attacked him, cut off his nose, and installed Tiberius as emperor in his place. Tiberius wrote to Simᶜan, the governor of Mount Lebanon, asking him to send the "Maronite army" against the Arabs and Simᶜan did so.[36] The "Maronite army" then met the Arab armies in battle with the result that the Arabs lost more than two hundred thousand men. The news of this victory reached Tiberius, who was much pleased; he exalted Simᶜan and sent a royal rose to Patriarch John Marun as a symbol of affection. He also wrote a letter to Marun praising his sanctity and requesting him to send three men known for their honesty and trustworthiness to become the bearers of the imperial baldachin. On receipt of the emperor's letter Marun chose three trustworthy men and sent them to Constantinople. In time, these three men married women of the imperial family and many of their descendants became kings and leaders of the Maronite people.[37] The kings were powerful and protected Syria and the sea coast from enemy raids. They also invaded the holy land, captured Jerusalem, and encouraged the Christians to visit there; for this reason some Byzantine slanderer betrayed John Marun to the metropolitan of Jerusalem, thus destroying the amicable relations between the two men.[38]

The entire episode of al-Duwayhi appears to be groundless; there is no mention of it in any available historical source. We encounter it for

the first time in the writing of al-Duwayhi, who provides no authentic or reliable source. Ancient and contemporary writers have thoroughly discussed the wars between the Byzantines and the Syrian Arabs after Syria became an Arab province in the seventh century. However, not one of them (not even the Byzantine chronicler Theophanes) has mentioned that there was a certain patriarch of Antioch named John Marun or that the Byzantine emperor sent an army led by Maurice and Maurician to capture him and send him to Constantinople in chains. Theophanes does not mention that the Byzantine army destroyed the Monastery of Marun and killed five hundred of its monks because the Maronites upheld the doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ. Nor does he state that they were "heretical" Monothelites believing in one will in Christ. Furthermore, we find in history no battle of Amiun between the Byzantine and "Maronite armies." Even more incredible is al-Duwayhi's claim that three Maronites were chosen to bear the emperor's baldachin and that they married women from the imperial court, eventually producing many kings and rulers for the Maronites. That al-Duwayhi has indiscriminately confused the Mardaites with the Maronites is obvious on reading his account of the episode. However, although al-Duwayhi's episode has no historical foundation, we should not let it pass without examination for the simple reason that the renowned contemporary historian Philip Hitti has accepted it without questioning its veracity.[39]

Al-Duwayhi's claim that Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, became furious at the Maronites and sent an army which destroyed the Monastery of Marun is historically groundless. The Monastery of Marun was still in existence in the ninth century. Referring once more to the testimony of Tal Mahri, who died in 845, he states that until his time the Maronites were installing a patriarch from their own monastery.[40] The Arab historian al-Mas'udi, who died in 956, relates that the Monastery of Marun fell into ruin because of the successive raids of the Bedouin Arabs and the tyranny of the Sultan.[41] We also learn from Tal Mahri that in the year 695 the Byzantine army penetrated Syria as far as Antioch but was repelled by the Arabs who killed most of the soldiers, and the remainder fled.[42] This indicates that the Byzantine army went as far as Antioch to fight against the Arabs, not to capture John Marun or destroy his monastery in 694 as al-Duwayhi alleged.[43] Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Byzantine army commanded by the alleged Maurice and Maurician entered Lebanon and met the Maronites in battle at Amiun. The claim that the Maronites and the Mardaites were one and the same people is untenable. According to Theophanes, Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, took advantage of the troubles of Umayyad Caliph Abd

al-Malik Ibn Marwan and broke the peace treaty his father, Constantine IV, Pogonatus, had signed before his death in 685 with Abd al-Malik. In 689 Abd al-Malik succeeded in arranging and signing a new ten-year peace treaty with Justinian II, Rhinotmetus. In this treaty he was to pay heavier tribute, but he made one decisive gain: he stipulated that the Byzantine emperor should evict the Mardaites who were harassing the Arabs from Lebanon. The emperor agreed and ordered the Mardaites out of Lebanon, stationing them in Armenia, Thrace, and Cyprus. It was a great blunder on the part of the emperor who, in the words of Theophanes, "destroyed by his own hands this brass wall which separated the borders from that of the Muslims."[44] The point is that if the Mardaites who were evicted from Lebanon were "the Maronites," whom did the Byzantine army fight at the battle of Amiun? And how are we expected to believe that the Byzantine emperor marshalled an entire army under two commanders to capture a single man, John Marun, and bring him to Constantinople in chains? It should be remembered that Lebanon was at that time under Arab, not Byzantine rule, and if the latter fought any war it was with the Arabs, not with the Lebanese. It is obvious that al-Duwayhi has confused Patriarch John Marun with his namesake John, a leader of the Mardaites, and the latter's nephew Simʿan with Simʿan a nephew of John Marun, and made this Simʿan the ruler of Lebanon.[45]

From the former account we may deduce that John Marun became a patriarch through the blessing of the Church of Rome, that the Maronite Church was not heretical Monothelite, but catholic and orthodox like the Church of Rome, and that the Byzantine Emperor Justinian II intended to chastise John Marun and his followers because they held the faith of the Church of Rome. This was not the case. At the second Trullan or Quinisext Council assembled in 692, Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, sanctioned the condemnation of Monothelitism.[46] The main purpose of the council was not to institute or explain a new doctrine; the Sixth Council had already established the doctrine of two wills in Christ. The second Trullan Council only affirmed some principles in hopes of restoring some order to Christian life which that council believed had become disorderly.[47] In other words, Emperor Justinian II, if we believe al-Duwayhi, was of the same faith as John Marun, and there was, therefore, no need to contend with him on this point. Furthermore, if the difference in faith was the only factor which motivated the emperor to pursue John Marun, punish him, and fight his followers, it would appear that the Maronites held a faith contrary to that of the emperor (in this case Monothelitism) and that the emperor must have

considered them heretics who should be restored to the "true faith," by means of war if necessary.[48]

Referring once more to al-Duwayhi's episode of the alleged war between the Byzantine army and the Maronites, we find him quoting *The Doctrine of the Jacobites.* In fact, he derives the name of the so-called battle of Amiun from this book. According to this book when the Byzantines (Malkites) reached the village of Amiun, John Marun and his nephew left for Samar Jubayl to protect its inhabitants from paying the poll tax which the Malkites imposed on those who refused to comply with their faith.[49] This, al-Duwayhi states, was the beginning of the separation between the Malkites and the Maronites. what al-Duwayhi means in this context is that those who accepted the faith of the Byzantines (one will in Christ) were called Malkites, and those who professed the faith of John Marun (allegedly two wills in Christ) were called Maronites.[50] In other words, al-Duwayhi purports that the Maronites became a separate denomination after the so-called battle of Amiun in 694; we have demonstrated that the Maronites emerged for the first time as a separate entity in the middle of the eighth century. Nevertheless, two questions arise out of al-Duwayhi's claim: did the term Malkite emerge as late as the year 694, and what is the historical validity of the *Doctrine of the Jacobites?*

The origin of the term Malkite and its connection with the Maronites will be discussed later. As to the validity of the *Doctrine of the Jacobites* as a historical source, this has also been discussed in Chapter 15. However, a few remarks about the book are in order. It is a fifteenth-century discourse written by a learned man, perhaps the Syrian Orthodox writer, Musa Ibn Atsha, who lived in Lebanon. The purpose of the author was to prove to the Maronites that the faith of the Syrian Orthodox Church, namely, *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*, is the true faith. In defending this faith, the author attempts to show the origin of the different Christian denominations in his time, including the Maronites, whom he considered to be Monothelites. In his discussion the author states that John Marun and his nephew left Samar Jubayl to protect its inhabitants from the poll tax imposed by the Malkites (the Byzantines) on those who refused their doctrine of one will in Christ. Since the author does not reveal his source and since we find no indication of this particular incident in any other source, we are inclined to dismiss the author's statement as fabrication. Making the author's statement even more doubtful is the fact that in 694, when the so-called battle of Amiun occurred, Lebanon was not under Byzantine but Umay-

yad rule. In sum, as a historical source the *Doctrine of the Jacobites* is unreliable, especially the information it contains about John Marun.[51]

Another source which contains a similar episode about the identity of John Marun is a treatise entitled *On the Testimonies of Our Early Fathers before the Division of the Faith* in the Vatican Library Arabic MS. 74.

The author of the treatise is undoubtedly a very devout Syrian Orthodox and a staunch opponent of the Council of Chalcedon and of Emperor Justinian I, who upheld the faith of this Council. The book elaborates on the life of Jacob Baradaeus, his activities in Syria and Egypt, and his ordination of thousands of clergymen, including a patriarch, to strengthen the anti-Chalcedonian churches of Syria and Egypt, which had been tremendously weakened by the persecution of the Chalcedonian Emperor Justin I. The author states that when "wicked" Justinian I heard of the emergence of a "Jacobite" church denomination, he took command of an army and marched into the countries to which the name of Jacob had spread, ordering his men to kill and destroy the followers of Jacob without mercy. When the emperor reached the city of Amida to ravage it, he found in it a solitary ascetic named Marun. The devil entered this Marun and enticed him to meet with the emperor and tell him falsely that he was from Qinnesrin and that the inhabitants of the sea coast, as well as the governor of the city of Antioch, had sent him to appeal to the emperor to grant them safety. In return, he (Marun) would never allow the name of Jacob Baradaeus to cross into the coastal area and Antioch. The emperor agreed and gave Marun a banner with the following inscription, "Everything that this Father tells you to do, do it."[52] Marun carried the banner to Antioch and told the governor of that city that he was carrying good tidings with him: that he had approached Emperor Justinian I and told him that the governor was faithful to him and to the faith of the Council of Chalcedon. He also told the governor how the emperor gave him this banner as a sign of safety for himself and for the people of Antioch. However, Marun was unable to alter the formula of faith, that is *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* preached by Jacob, but resorting to a trick said, "I shall sign the cross with two fingers and will confess two natures and one will in Christ after their union."[53] When the governor heard these words he placed a crown over Marun's head and took him to the coastal towns. Marun then wrote to Justinian that the people of the coastal towns had accepted the formula of faith of Chalcedon. Later Justinian I, discovering that Marun had lied to him, expelled him and his followers and had him stoned near

a village in the district of Samar Jubayl in Lebanon, where his remains rest until this day. For this reason this village is called Kfarhayy, the place of the living one. Since then both the Malkites and the "Jacobites" have not accepted the Maronites. Until the sixteenth century the Maronite signed the cross like the Malkites with two fingers, and like the "Jacobites" they sign the same cross with one finger when they recite the daily supplicatory prayers (Boʿuothos) in Syriac. They also profess one power, one might, and one true God although they recognize two natures and one will in Christ. The only "Jacobite" father who condemned these Maronites was Gewargi (George) the Maphrain (catholicos) of Tagrit.[54]

From this episode we learn that this Marun could not be the fifth-century ascetic of the same name but was a John Marun whom the author erroneously makes a contemporary with Emperor Justinian I. This Marun and his followers were Monothelites recognizing one will in Christ. Their conversion to Monothelitism must have occurred in the seventh century when John Marun was allegedly still a monk, rather than the sixth century. The author does not reveal his source regarding the meeting between Marun and the emperor. It would appear that the whole episode is fictitious, but the author of *The Doctrine* is correct in stating that to distinguish themselves from the "Jacobites" the Maronites began to sign the cross with two fingers like the Malkites, while the "Jacobites" signed the cross with one finger only. He is also correct in stating that unlike the Malkites, who recognized two natures and two wills in Christ, Marun and his followers professed two natures and one will in Christ. That the Maronites signed the cross with two fingers is attested to by al-Qilaʿi in his *Zajaliyya* (ode).[55]

Of interest in this episode, too, is that the author makes the village of Kfarhayy the place where Marun was stoned and buried; the Maronites claim that after being chased by the Byzantine army, John Marun moved to Kfarhayy where he built another monastery named the Monastery of Marun to which he transferred the skull of the fifth-century ascetic Marun.[56] According to al-Duwayhi, after a very active and righteous life, John Marun died and was buried in the Monastery of St. Marun, east of the village of Kfarhayy.[57] The Maronite Church did not begin to commemorate him, however, until the year 1624. Al-Duwayhi states that in this year the Syriac book of weekday prayers (The Ishhim) was translated from Syriac into Latin by order of the pope. Learned men examined it thoroughly and decided that this "great saint" (meaning John Marun) should be commemorated on February 9 of each year.[58] Al-Duwayhi produces the Syriac text of the anthem chanted in the Syrian Orthodox Church at the beginning of every year in commemoration of

the church fathers who established the orthodox faith. The anthem contains a list of the names of these fathers, including those who rejected and condemned the Council of Chalcedon (such as, Dioscorus of Alexandria, and Severus of Antioch). The names of these fathers are deleted from the version cited by al-Duwayhi, and the name of Marun is inserted instead.[59] Al-Duwayhi does not mention the date of John Marun's death, but Assemani fixes his death on February 9, 707, although he fails to produce evidence to substantiate it.[60] However, al-Duwayhi states that nine days after his death, the chief priests and abbots met and elected Marun's nephew Cyrus, a "Patriarch of Antioch."[61] They informed the pope in Rome of the election, and the pope sent the new patriarch the pallium with a letter of investiture. Al-Duwayhi concludes that at that time "the Maronite Patriarchs began to wear a mitre and a ring according to the custom of the great Church of Rome."[62] According to Assemani, the first Maronite patriarch to receive a mitre and a ring from a pope was Irmia (Jeremiah) al-Amshiti in 1216.[63] As al-Qilaʿi had done, al-Duwayhi confused John Marun with this thirteenth-century Maronite patriarch. As to the commemoration of Marun, we shall see later that even the Lebanese Council assembled in 1736 did not set a date for the commemoration of John Marun.

17

John Marun's Writings

Some attribute the authorship of several books to John Marun. Outstanding among these books is the *Exposition of the Faith* contained in the Vatican Syriac MS 146, transcribed in 1392. Al-Duwayhi attributes no less than ten books and letters to John Marun. Abraham Ecchellensis attributes two books to him: one a commentary on the liturgy and the other a treatise on the priesthood.[1] Assemani accepts John Marun's authorship of only two books: the *Exposition of the Faith* and a composition of a liturgy. However, he denies the authorship of the two books attributed to Marun by Ecchellensis; he does so on the grounds that the commentary on the liturgy belongs to Dionysius Bar Salibi (d. 1171) and that the treatise on the priesthood was written by Yuhanna (John) of Dara (d. 860), both of whom were fathers of the Syrian Church.[2] Nevertheless, Maronite bishop al-Dibs insists that the author of these books was no other than John Marun.[3]

Some Maronites assert that John Marun composed a liturgy. According to Assemani a copy of this liturgy is in the fifth volume of the books compiled by Abraham Ecchellensis in the Vatican Library.[4] This Syriac manuscript was transcribed in Cyprus in the year 1846 of the Greek calendar (1535 A.D.). It begins: "Before thee O King of Kings and Lord of Lords."[5] French Orientalist Eusèbe Renaudot (1646–1720), the first European to publish a collection of Eastern liturgies, found no liturgy by John Marun to include in this collection.[6] Furthermore,

Renaudot rightfully observes that the majority of ancient writers and luminaries of the Syrian Church were "Jacobites," not Maronites.[7] In other words, Renaudot asserts that the books claimed to be written by Maronites were in fact penned by "Jacobite" authors. Apparently Assemani was not pleased with the reasons Renaudot gives for not including John Marun's liturgy in his collection and particularly for his statement that he did not find it in any liturgy. He criticizes Renaudot saying that, as if he had searched through all of the libraries and checked all the manuscripts they contain, or as if he left no manuscript in the East which he has not read in order to assert that he has not found a liturgy drawn by John Marun.[8] Such criticism confirmed the opinion of some writers that Assemani was jealous of Renaudot, harboring deep antipathy toward him, although he was frequently forced to praise his scholarly erudition.[9]

There is evidence that this liturgy does not belong to John Marun. It appeared for the first time in 1535 in Cyprus, almost eight hundred years after the time of John Marun. During this period there is no known report of this liturgy and no mention by any researcher. Even when Maronite Bishop Athanasius Safar copied it in Rome in 1677, he stated that it had been transcribed one hundred and fifty years earlier by a Maronite from the village of Haqil, Yadis Yamin (son of Salim), who transcribed it in Cyprus. Obviously, Safar's copy was made later than the one found in Cyprus in 1535.[10] The point is that there is no evidence that this liturgy was known to Maronites before the sixteenth century, which leads us to believe that it could not have been written by the "founder" of the Maronite Church. Strangely enough, it appeared for the first time not in Lebanon, the home of the Maronites, but in Cyprus. We may then conclude that this liturgy was copied from the "Liturgy of the Twelve Apostles" used by the Syrian Orthodox Church. Equally strange is that this liturgy was not included in the collection of liturgies published by the Maronites in Rome in 1594, which contained fourteen liturgies, most of which belong to the Syrian Orthodox Church.[11] Of the authors of these liturgies we may mention Yuhanna Bar Shushan, Marutha of Tagrit, and Dionysius Bar Salibi. We find no liturgy in this collection which belongs to the founder and first patriarch of the Maronite Church. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud is of the opinion that the liturgy must have been plagiarized by a sixteenth-century Maronite native of Cyprus who ascribed it to John Marun.[12]

The author has personally examined the Maronite collection of liturgies published in Rome in 1594 and found no liturgy among them by John Marun.[13] Indeed, not only is this liturgy erroneously ascribed to

John Marun, but most of the Maronite ritual books were perhaps composed by the fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church. Contemporary Maronite writer, Rev. Mikha'il al-Rajji, admits that not a single author has yet attributed a separate rite to the Maronites which would distinguish them from the "Jacobites" and other Syrian.[14] Al-Rajji gives his opinion that the liturgies published in Rome in 1594 should be more correctly attributed to the "Jacobites" rather than to the Maronites. But al-Rajji ascribes the Maronites' use of "Jacobite" liturgies to the so-called "Jacobite influence" and to the novelty of printing. He states:

> As "Jacobite" influence was still strong [in Lebanon] and printers were still beginner in their craft, many significant portions of the "Jacobite rite" as well as many liturgies found their way into the books of Maronite liturgies with the result that our Maronite ancient rite and theirs became intertwined. Their liturgies were listed next to, indeed, came ahead in order of our ancient liturgy ascribed to the Twelve Apostles in such a way that it would be more correct in my humble opinion to ascribe this book of liturgies to the "Jacobites" than to the Maronites.[15]

While the liturgies published by Maronites in Rome in 1594 belonged to the Syrian Orthodox Church, one cannot understand why al-Rajji referred to the liturgy of the Twelve Apostles as "our ancient liturgy." Al-Rajji finds himself in a dilemma when trying to distinguish between what he calls "Jacobite" and Maronite liturgies. However, he explicitly states that all the ritual books, including the 1594 liturgies, which contain the names of "Jacobite" fathers such as Severus of Antioch, Barsauma, and others are not Maronite but "Jacobite." They should not be considered Maronite even if they were found among the Maronites or printed for the use of Maronites.[16] But how can one justify the fact that the collection of liturgies published in Rome in 1594 bears the title *The Book of the Offering of the Eucharist According to Maronite Tradition,* which indicates that they were Maronite. However, al-Rajji does offer an answer by admitting that the Maronites suffered from a dearth of ritual books. Another Maronite, Jabra'il al-Sihyuni (Gabriel Sionita, d. 1648), puts this whole issue very mildly in his letter to the learned Niosius in 1644 in relation to the so-called Maronite liturgies. He writes that "the existing liturgies are shared between the Maronites and the 'Jacobites' because the ritual books of the Maronites and the 'Jacobites' are one and the same."[17] Indeed, the whole issue requires further investigation, and until new evidence is found to the contrary the author retains the opinion that the Maronite liturgies are of Syrian Orthodox origin.

Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs admits that the ancient ritual books of the Maronites and the "Jacobites" were identical. He affirms that these books were composed before the Syrian Church of Antioch was divided into two groups, Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian. Such reasoning is tenuous because there was no established Maronite church or Maronite community in the middle of the fifth century when the Syrian Church of Antioch split over the definition of faith after the Council of Chalcedon. Furthermore, we are led to believe that the liturgies used by the Syrian Church of Antioch were the same, regardless of the different denominations originally under its ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Maronite Church had no liturgy of its own, and the liturgy ascribed to John Marun was most likely plagiarized from Syrian Orthodox father of the church, Dionysius Bar Salibi, metropolitan of Amida, (d. 1171).[18]

Another book attributed to John Marun by Abraham Ecchellensis is *An Exposition of the Eucharistic Service,* a commentary on the liturgy commonly known in the Syrian Church as the liturgy of Saint James, brother of our Lord. A copy of this commentary is in the Vatican Library transcribed by Ecchellensis himself in 1660.[19] We are informed by Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud that Ecchellensis plagiarized this commentary on the liturgy from Dionysius Bar Salibi and ascribed it to John Marun.[20] Dawud is correct because Bar Salibi, a Syrian Orthodox, naturally cited in his commentary on this liturgy the testimonies of fathers of his own church as corroboration of the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos.* This is evidenced in his commentary on the fracture and co-mixture of the bread and the wine, which are united in an ineffable manner to indicate the unity of the two natures of Christ. He writes: "He is one Immanuel, and is not divisible into two natures after the union of these natures."[21] As a Chalcedonian, Abraham Ecchellensis made many changes in this commentary, with the intention of harmonizing it with the faith of Chalcedon. According to Eusèbe Renaudot, this commentary on the liturgy of Saint James is the work of Dionysius Bar Salibi.[22] Assemani confirms the opinion of Renaudot and promises to elaborate on this subject in the second volume of his *Biblitheca Orientalis.* He fails to fulfill his promise but is satisfied with pointing out that Abraham Ecchellensis attributed to John Marun a commentary on the liturgy similar to the one written by Bar Salibi.[23] This misled al-Dibs into believing that, in the second volume of his previously mentioned work, Assemani changed his mind because he now indicates that Bar Salibi had a commentary on the liturgy other than the one attributed to john Marun. Al-Dibs concludes that it is probable that Bar Salibi plagiarized the

commentary on the liturgy by John Marun.[24] What Assemani in fact says is that Ecchellensis incorporated a large portion of Bar Salibi's commentary into the commentary on the liturgy Ecchellensis ascribed to John Marun. But whether Ecchellensis plagiarized the entire commentary of Bar Salibi, or a large portion of it as Assemani affirms, the fact remains that Assemani does not approve of Ecchellensis's ascription of this commentary on the liturgy to John Marun. However, al-Dibs insists, without justification, that Assemani did approve and cites the following evidence to support his viewpoint. He states that Maronite Rev. Butrus Mubarak quoted the commentary on the liturgy in two articles he wrote on Saint Ephraim, and that Assemani approved the publication of these articles in 1740, without alerting the author to the fact that the quoted commentary was not written by John Marun. Such evidence is indeed untenable and by no means proves that the author of this commentary is John Marun.[25] Likewise, it is difficult to believe as al-Dibs did that Assemani's nephew, Yusuf Louis Assemani (d. 1782), had published this commentary in his *Codex Liturgicus* in Rome in 1752 in the name of John Marun and that its publication drew no objection or comment by the great Assemani, meaning that the latter accepted it as a genuine work of John Marun.[26] After presenting this tenuous argument, al-Dibs finally states that his intention was "to prove decisively" that this commentary on the liturgy belongs to John Marun.[27] Unfortunately, all he succeeded in doing was iterate the untenable opinions of Yusuf Louis Assemani.

Al-Dibs further states that he found in the library of the Maronite patriarchate in Lebanon a commentary on the liturgy, transcribed in Rome in 1670 by Rev. Butrus Makhluf (Maronite bishop of Cyprus). Al-Dibs claims that he collated this commentary with the portions of Bar Salibi's commentary on the liturgy published by Yusuf Louis Assemani; there were several points of difference between the two versions. According to al-Dibs, the commentary of Bar Salibi is addressed to the Syrian bishop of Jerusalem, Ignatius; however, the other version contains no such address. He also contends that the commentary of Bar Salibi contains twenty chapters, while the one he claims was written by John Marun comprises fifty. Finally, al-Dibs states that he found many doctrinal statements in this liturgy which could not have been written by Bar Salibi because they contradict his belief in one nature in Christ.[28] These, to be sure, are not the opinions of al-Dibs but of Yusuf Louis Assemani. Assemani states that, following Renaudot, Istefan al-Duwayhi recognized that this commentary was written by Bar Salibi. He contends that his uncle, the great Assemani, agrees with Renaudot and al-Duwayhi on this point.[29] However, Yusuf Louis Assemani remarks that, with all due

respect to the opinion of his uncle and to that of al-Duwayhi, he still believes that the commentary on the liturgy was written by John Marun. He states further that Renaudot's statement that this commentary was not written by John Marun, because no writer had even mentioned it, is not sufficient evidence that John Marun was not the author. Yusuf Louis Assemani insists that he has collated the two commentaries on the liturgy—the one by Bar Salibi and the other by John Marun—and found them different from each other. He claims that some of these differences are of doctrinal importance. For instance, Bar Salibi confirms that his church used leavened Eucharistic bread while John Marun states that his church used unleavened bread and that, contrary to the belief of the Maronite church, Bar Salibi attributes the transubstantiation of the bread and the wine during the Eucharistic service to the call of the Holy Ghost.[30] Be that is it may, both Yusuf Louis Assemani and al-Dibs appear to have believed that the commentary on the liturgy is genuinely the work of John Marun, that it is different from the commentary of Bar Salibi and that the latter, who lived in the twelfth century, plagiarized the commentary written by John Marun, who lived in the seventh century. These conclusions are hardly credible.

The commentary attributed to John Marun is identical with the commentary written by Bar Salibi, except for some portions where changes were made by Abraham Ecchellensis to bring John Marun's alleged commentary into conformity with the Chalcedonian faith. It is a fact that Syriac scholars, both Eastern and Western, have always recognized the commentary on the liturgy under discussion as belonging to Dionysius Bar Salibi. No available ancient writer relates that John Marun wrote a commentary on a liturgy. Renaudot is correct in stating that he has not found a commentary on the liturgy by John Marun. In fact, he is of the opinion that it is possible that there was never a patriarch of Antioch by the name of John Marun.[31] The claim that John Marun wrote this commentary on the liturgy is relatively recent and was asserted for the first time by Maronites such as Abraham Ecchellensis and Gabriel Sionita in the seventeenth century; this indicates that the Maronites did not know of the commentary on the liturgy by John Marun prior to that century.[32] According to Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, while he was in Rome, Ecchellensis transcribed this copy of the commentary on the liturgy in his own handwriting and ascribed it to John Marun.[33] In fact, there is an Arabic translation of this commentary by a fifteenth-century Syrian writer, Musa Ibn Atsha, contained in the very book al-Duwayhi and other Maronites call *The Doctrine of the Jacobites,* the book they use so often as evidence to prove the originality

of their church and community.[34] M'Abbe Labourt has established that his commentary on the liturgy is the work of Dionysius Bar Salibi.[35]

We may give here few examples of Abraham Ecchellensis tampering with Bar Salibi's commentary on the liturgy. On the presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements of both the bread and the wine Ecchellensis, through John Marun, states: "As Jesus is manifested as a man while He is truly and essentially God, so it is with these two elements. They appear as bread and wine but in reality and in essence they are the body and blood of our Saviour with the characteristics of bread and wine."[36] Here is what Bar Salibi has to say about the same subject:

> The body and blood are called mysteries because they cannot be seen. However, they appear as though they were bread and wine but in reality they are the body and blood of God. And as Jesus Christ was manifested as a man while He was God, so it is with these elements for they appear as bread and wine but in reality they are the body and blood of Christ. Furthermore, although the Holy Spirit transforms the mysteries into body and blood, yet they are the body and blood of the Son.[37]

From a purely doctrinal point of view the gravest error Ecchellensis made is in the fourth and fifth chapters of the alleged commentary on the liturgy of John Marun. He included the *Exposition of the Eucharistic Service* by the father of the Syrian Church, Jacob of Edessa (d. 708). Jacob's treatise was reproduced by Assemani from Bar Salibi's commentary on the liturgy.[38] Perhaps we will never know what motivated Ecchellensis to include the *Exposition of the Eucharistic Service* of Jacob of Edessa in the commentary on the liturgy, although some writers accused him of committing an act of "wickedness."[39] What probably motivated some Maronites to plagiarize books of the Syrian Orthodox Church was the dearth of Maronite ritual books. Furthermore, the fact that both the Maronite and the Syrian Orthodox churches shared common Syriac heritage and language made such plagiarism possible.

Another book ascribed to John Marun is *On Priesthood.* According to Assemani, the book *On Priesthood* comprises forty chapters and is listed as No. 64 in the list of books compiled by Ecchellensis.[41] It was transcribed by Ecchellensis himself, but he provided no information about the manuscript from which he took it. After studying the copy made by Ecchellensis, Assemani concludes that the book was not written by John Marun but by the Syrian writer, John, bishop of Dara (d. 860).[42] Assemani informs us that he made further study of the original manu-

script of this book and collated it with the copy transcribed by Ecchellensis. He discovered that Ecchellensis included in his copy no less than thirty-two chapters of the original manuscript, ascribing the entire work to John Marun.[43] However, Assemani's ascription of this book to John of Dara seems to be in error. The copy which Assemani used is different, as he admits he is only conjecturing that it belonged to John of Dara. A complete copy of this book, transcribed in 1224, is at the Sharfa Monastery in Lebanon. It bears the name of the writer and father of the Syrian Church, Moses Bar Kifa (d. 903), bishop of Baremman.[44] In the fourth part of the book *On Priesthood* there is a title which reads thus: "*The Fourth Part of the Book On Priesthood* by the blessed Moses Bar Kifa." Similar titles appear at the beginning of parts five and six, the latter being "A Discourse for the benefit of the children of the holy church written by Saint Severus who is Moses bar Kifa, bishop of Baremman already mentioned."[45] This Sharfa manuscript also contains other treatises by the same Moses Bar Kifa of which Assemani had no knowledge. It is thus obvious that the book *On Priesthood* belongs to Moses Bar Kifa and not to John of Dara or to John Marun.[46]

The ascription of *On Priesthood* to John of Dara and the identification of Moses Bar Kifa, as opposed to John Marun as its author, displeased the Maronite Bishop al-Dibs, who insisted, without evidence, that the author was John Marun.[47] All that al-Dibs produces to support his claim is the opinion of Yusuf Louis Assemani, who attempted to prove that his uncle, the great Assemani, was incorrect in denying the authorship of this to John Marun, and in ascribing it instead to John of Dara whose version is totally different from that of John Marun's.[48] Yusuf Louis Assemani is correct in stating that the two versions are totally different. However, he failed to recognize, as did his uncle Joseph Assemani before him, that *On Priesthood* belongs not to John of Dara but to Moses Bar Kifa and that it is natural for the two versions to be different from each other. Consequently, his argument against his uncle, based on the premise that *On Priesthood* was written by John Marun and not by John of Dara, has no validity. Likewise, al-Dibs's claim that John of Dara plagiarized the writings of John Marun has no historical validity.[49] Other Maronites such as Rev. Mikha'il al-Rajji have established that *On Priesthood* does not belong to John Marun.[50] The controversy caused some writers to censure the Maronites for distorting the truth about the origins of their ritual books.[51]

Another book ascribed to John Marun is the *Exposition of the Faith* which exists both in Syriac and Arabic translation (Garshuni) and

is listed as No. 14 of the books compiled by Ecchellensis in the Vatican Library.[52] At present this manuscript is listed under Syriac MS 146 in the Vatican Library.

Unlike the other books ascribed to John Marun, *Exposition of the Faith* poses several problems, one of which is its date. Assemani believes that this manuscript was transcribed in 1392, but Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud dates it in either 1422 or 1472; however, Rev. F. Nau maintains that it dates back to the seventh century when John Marun lived.[53] To prove his point, Nau relates that among the testimonies produced by John Marun in his alleged *Exposition of the Faith* is that derived from Saint Ephraim's metrical hymn on the Nativity of our Lord. In this hymn, Nau claims, Saint Ephraim recognizes two distinct natures, the divine and the human, in Christ. Nau also states that he found a letter from the Syrian Church Father Jacob of Edessa to a certain Deacon George and that it contained solutions to questions asked by the deacon. One question was about some passages contained in the same metrical hymn of Saint Ephraim on the Nativity of our Lord.[54] Nau claims that in this letter Jacob of Edessa produces from Saint Ephraim the same testimony on the two natures of Christ which John Marun cites in his alleged *Exposition of the Faith.* Nau concludes that since John Marun and Jacob of Edessa were contemporaries, the "Jacobites" distorted this metrical hymn of Saint Ephraim by deleting from it the reference to the two natures of Christ because of this contradiction with the "Jacobite" doctrine of one nature in Christ; in his letter to Deacon George, however, Jacob of Edessa mentions two natures in Christ. The Reverend Nau further states that, because he quotes it in its original form, John Marun must have lived before these "Jacobites" distorted this metrical hymn of Saint Ephraim. In other words, John Marun used sources not distorted by the "Jacobites" to fit their belief in one nature in Christ. Finally, Nau reaches the conclusion that the sources used by John Marun were "Catholic" and that John Marun and his followers were "Catholic" (that is, Chalcedonian and upholders of the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon.)[55] This may be somewhat confusing. In essence, what Rev. Nau is saying is that both John Marun and Jacob of Edessa lived in the same period, that both quoted the metrical hymn of Saint Ephraim on the Nativity of our Lord with its mention of Christ's two nature—the divine and the human—and that Saint Ephraim's recognition of two natures in Christ is in conformity with the formula of faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon. This formula recognized that the two natures of Christ were distinct and remained distinct from each other even after their union in one person. We may also infer from Nau's account that those

who professed one nature in Christ and rejected the formula of faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon (those he calls "Jacobites") deliberately removed the reference to the two natures of Christ from Saint Ephraim's metrical hymn on the Nativity of the Lord; they did so in order to demonstrate that prior to the Council of Chalcedon in 451 no one had mentioned that Christ had two distinct natures. In sum, Nau tries to affirm two things: first, that John Marun was a "Catholic," meaning Chalcedonian, who professed the "Catholic" faith of two distinct natures in Christ, a faith in complete harmony with that of the Council of Chalcedon and the Church of Rome; and second, that Marun's *Exposition of the Faith,* which contains this doctrine of the two natures in Christ and dates back to his time in the seventh century, is genuinely his own work.

There is no evidence that the "Jacobites" distorted Saint Ephraim's hymn, including the reference to the two natures of Christ, in order to destroy material not in conformity with their faith. The matter deserves more than an isolated opinion. Furthermore, the idea that John Marun and Jacob of Edessa were contemporaries and cited the same source in their writing does not substantiate the *Exposition of the Faith* as a seventh-century work. The fact is that, regardless of their theological views, the fathers of the Eastern churches recognized and appreciated the writings and intellectual contributions of Jacob of Edessa, a great doctor of the Syrian Church. On the other hand we find no evidence of these fathers, having given recognition or appreciation of the alleged writings of John Marun. In essence, how could they have had if the writings did not exist? Indeed, from the end of the seventh to the middle of the seventeenth centuries there is complete silence on the writings of John Marun. Maronite students in Rome in the seventeenth century were the first to ascribe ritual books to John Marun. Reliable Western Syriac scholars and church historians do not mention or refer to any writings of John Marun. One of these eminent scholars, William Wright, who affords Jacob of Edessa among his countrymen "much the same place as Jerome (had) among the Latin Fathers" and describes him as a "man of great culture and wide reading," mentions not one word about John Marun.[56] The Reverend J. B. Chabot, in his critical analysis of ancient Syriac sources, also shows not only the lack of historicity of John Marun but the lack of authenticity of his alleged writings.[57]

From a purely doctrinal point of view Rev. Nau's conclusions are even more untenable. He speculates that it was after 659 when "Jacobites" deleted the reference to the two natures in Christ from Saint Ephraim's metrical hymn. He states that in that year the "Jacobites" and

the Maronites debated on religious matters in the presence of the Umayyad Caliph Muʿawiya. During the debate the Maronite monks cited the metrical hymn of Saint Ephraim in the hope that Saint Ephraim's recognition of two separate and distinct natures in Christ would demolish their opponents' believe in *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos.* Realizing that they had lost the debate, the "Jacobites" removed from this hymn of Saint Ephraim the reference to the two natures in Christ and the practice continues to this day.[58] The Reverend Nau seems to have overlooked the fact that Saint Ephraim's reference to the two natures "of" and not "in" Christ has no theological or doctrinal connotation in the same vein as the formula of faith defined by Chalcedon, as Nau would have wished it. Saint Ephraim lived in the fourth century, almost one hundred years before the doctrinal dispute over the mode of the union of the two natures of Christ became a real issue. Church fathers of the first three centuries of the Christian era obviously believed that their Lord had two natures, but they never discussed the manner of the union of these two natures with each other or the outcome of their union. This union became a serious issue only in the first half of the fifth century when Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, denied that the Virgin Mary gave birth to God and therefore refused to call her *Theotokos* (Mother of God); he preferred to call her *Christotokos* (Mother of Christ) on the premise that she gave birth to a man who received his divinity later. The mode of union of the two natures of Christ also became a serious issue when Eutyches, an abbot of a monastery in Constantinople, denied the reality of the body of Christ and claimed that in the Incarnation the divine nature of Christ absorbed the human nature, with the result that Christ had but one divine nature. This was the beginning of what students of theology conveniently termed the "Monophysite-Diphysite" controversy. The reference of Saint Ephraim to the two natures of Christ had no bearing on this controversy in order to empower the Maronite debaters before the caliph to claim that they have found in Saint Ephraim a passage supporting their supposed "Catholic faith" (meaning the Chalcedonian faith maintained by the Church of Rome). What is peculiar is that Bishop al-Dibs, who relates Nau's citation of the letter of Jacob of Edessa to Deacon George, calls Jacob a saint, not realizing that this luminary of the Syrian Church was anti-Chalcedonian and a firm believer and defender of the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos,* a doctrine which John Marun attempts to refute in his alleged *Exposition of the Faith.*[59] To the Chalcedonians Jacob was a "heretic" not a saint.

The main problem with the *Exposition of the Faith* is its authorship and its contents. Assemani is indecisive on both points. In his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (1, 513) he treats the book as if it were written by John Marun, but in describing MS 146, he states in the same *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (1, 576) that the *Exposition of the Faith* is "ascribed to John Marun," which means that John Marun is not the author. The preamble of the copy of this manuscript is in Ashqut, Lebanon MS 47 expressly indicates that this book is ascribed to John Marun.[60] We shall see later that Maronites, including Assemani, accused Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, of tampering with the *Exposition of the Faith* to make it conform to Monothelitism. While we cannot determine with certainty the Syriac origin of the *Exposition,* its contents prove that its author was a Syrian Orthodox Monophysite who believed in *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos,* although he outwardly espoused Monothelitism. That the author is a Syrian Orthodox is demonstrated in the testimonies of prominent fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church, which the author quoted frequently. The author's refutation of Nestorius and the treatise on the Trisagion (appended to the manuscript) were plagiarized from a Syrian Orthodox source and have been attributed to John Marun.[61] Regardless of its authorship, the emphasis throughout the book is toward substantiation of the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism), with heavy inclination toward the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* (Monophysitism).

What confirms the belief that this book is of "Monophysite-Monothelite" origin is that in its preface the author attacks the Nestorians, who separate the two natures of Christ, and the Eutychians, who confuse these two natures with each other. Most particularly, he attacks Maximus, who defended the doctrine of two wills in Christ. This preface could not have been written by John Marun, who Maronites claim was a defender of the doctrine of two wills in Christ; otherwise he would not have attacked Maximus who professed and defended that doctrine. It is more likely that the preface was written by a copyist who states that the *Exposition of the Faith* was written by the "Holy Marun, Patriarch of Antioch at the Monastery of Marun."[62] The copyist continues explaining the reasons for the writing of the book. He states that when the Christian faith was disturbed by the teaching of Nestorius, who distinguished between the two natures of Christ and destroyed their union, and by the "silly" Eutyches, who confused these natures with each other, John, surnamed Marun, guided those who professed belief in the teaching of these two men, explaining to them the true faith as based on the

testimonies he cites in the book. The copyist goes on to say that John Marun refuted Maximus's profession of two wills in Christ to the followers of that idea and then wrote the *Exposition of the Faith* against these opposing doctrines.[63]

According to Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, Abraham Ecchellensis tampered with the preface of the *Exposition of the Faith* so it would read as if John Marun were an upholder of the doctrine of two wills in Christ attempting to refute the doctrine of one will in Christ. Dawud asserts that before the preface was added to the manuscripts in the Vatican Library, the Syriac MS 146 containing the *Exposition of the Faith* was the property of Abraham Ecchellensis.[64] He further states that Ecchellensis distorted the Syriac text by erasing the first three letters of Maximus and inserting in their place "Ant", so it reads "Antimus" instead of "Maximus." On the right margin of the manuscript he wrote, "some copies read Cyrus" instead of Antimus. Furthermore, to show that John Marun was a defender of the doctrine of two wills, Ecchellensis, whenever the term one will occurred, substituted "two" for "one" so it reads "two wills" instead of "one will." The erasure of the term one will is easily detected.[65] However, Ecchellensis failed to make the same changes in the Arabic (Garshuni) translation which appears in a second column next to the Syriac text, the terms Maximus and two wills being left intact.[66]

The purpose of Ecchellensis is obvious. He intended to absolve John Marun from Monothelitism, considered a heresy by the Church of Rome and to portray him as the defender of the "true" and "Catholic" faith. For this reason he distorted the name of Maximus, defender of the doctrine of two wills in Christ, into Antimus or Anthimus, an upholder of the doctrine of one will in Christ; but who is this Anthimus? Certainly he is not the sixth-century "Monophysite" patriarch of Constantinople (535–536) who allied himself with Severus, patriarch of Antioch, when the latter was invited to the capital by Emperor Justinian I to discuss the unity of the churches and to adopt the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. Monothelitism did not become an issue until one hundred years later, and it is reported that only one Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople occupied the See of Constantinople and did so for only one year—635.[67] Thus, the sixth-century Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, could not have been the one mentioned by Ecchellensis. Even if there were a Monothelite patriarch in existence at a time that would fit Ecchellensis's work there is no evidence that he wrote anything in defense of Monothelitism that could be refuted by John Marun.[68]

In the margin of he same manuscript Ecchellensis wrote the name of Cyrus to indicate that some copies contain this name instead of Anthimus.[69] Again Ecchellensis's intention appears to be to prove that in his *Exposition of the Faith* John Marun also refuted Cyrus, a Monothelite. But who was Cyrus? He was the metropolitan of Phasis and the protagonist of the Monothelite doctrine. In 626 Emperor Heraclius advised him to communicate with Sergius, the Monothelite patriarch of Constantinople. He did so, and Sergius was able to convert Cyrus to Monothelitism. Later, it was reported that Cyrus had become a patriarch of Alexandria.[70] On careful study of this part of the *Exposition of the Faith* we discover that the substitution of Cyrus for Anthimus does not make sense; if the intention of John Marun was to counter the Monothelites, he should have directed his refutation against Macarius, Monothelite patriarch of Antioch, not against Cyrus or Anthimus. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatever that Cyrus had any followers or disciples to propagate his Monothelite doctrine to an extent which would necessitate the effort of someone like John Marun to refute it. Historical evidence shows that Monothelitism was condemned by the Sixth Council when it was assembled in 680;[71] after this date the only people who professed the doctrine of one will in Christ were the Maronites and the Syrian Orthodox, "Monophysites" or "Jacobites." John Marun, who lived several decades after the time of that council, must have been a Monothelite who refuted the doctrine of the two wills in Christ (which Maximus defended) and embraced the doctrine of one will in Christ. Historical and textual evidence support the thesis that the *Exposition of the Faith* ascribed to John Marun was distorted in order to portray him as the defender of the doctrine of two wills in Christ as professed by the Church of Rome. This was done with the purpose of establishing the Maronites' claim that their church had held the same faith (the Chalcedonian faith) as the Church of Rome since the fifth century.

To any suggestion that in the *Exposition of the Faith* John Marun intended only to refute the Malkites who believed in two wills in Christ, there is no evidence that this was the case. Not even MS 146, in which is found the oldest known copy of the *Exposition of the Faith*, includes any such evidence. Indeed, there is no refutation in this book of the Nestorian or the so-called "Monophysite" doctrine, nor is there any refutation of Monothelitism. How, then, could anyone assert that John Marun refuted prominent Monothelites like "Anthimus" and Cyrus? Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud provides a proper answer. He states that after Abraham Ecchellensis distorted the preface to the *Exposition of the*

Faith he found it too tedious to erase John Marun's alleged refutation of the Monothelites; instead he used an easier method to achieve his aim. He tore out pages 125, 126, and 127, which contain a refutation of the Nestorians and those who professed two wills in Christ, inserting in their places new pages containing a dialogue with the Malkites written by Syrian poet and writer David Bar Paul (750–840). This dialogue is concerned with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* in the Trisagion, which the Malkites rejected and falsely ascribed to John Marun, as Assemani himself admits.[72]

Assemani claims that the *Exposition of the Faith* was distorted by Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, whom he also maintains has translated it into Arabic.[73] This claim is not new. We have seen previously that al-Qilaʿi was the first to accuse Tuma of distorting the books of the Maronites. In the copy of this manuscript formerly at Ashqut, but now owned by the Maronite Patriarchate Library at Bkerki in Lebanon, al-Qilaʿi, in 1503, wrote in red ink that this book contains "the black and the white, the poison and the antidote."[74] He also wrote that he determined to "purify it from the tares and burn what has been interpolated into it."[75] He desisted from his design, however, because the manuscript was the property of the sons of the priest Yusuf of the village of Haqil. Al-Qilaʿi also denies that the Maronites had a Bishop Tuma in Kfartab, claiming that Tuma was a "Jacobite" bishop, originally from Mardin in Turkey, who went to Lebanon to preach the "heresy" of Monothelitism.[76] Faustus Nairon and Istefan al-Duwayhi agree with al-Qilaʿi on this point.[77]

Like al-Qilaʿi and al-Duwayhi before him, Assemani seems to believe that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, distorted the *Exposition of the Faith*. Assemani states that the passage in the preface indicating that John Marun refuted the followers of Anthimus was interpolated by the translator—Tuma, bishop of Kfartab.[78] He contends that in this the patriarch, John Marun, wrote nothing to refute the Monothelites and Dithelites (those who professed two wills in Christ) or even mentioned them. After all, says Assemani, Maronites had nothing to fear because of this heresy, and thus there was no reason for John Marun to refute it. He continues that the idea that John Marun refuted the doctrine of two wills in Christ is likewise the outcome of the confused imagination of Tuma. Assemani also contends that there is nowhere in the book a discussion of the subject of two wills in Christ. All that Marun explains, says Assemani, is the doctrine of the two natures united in one person (the formula of faith of Chalcedon), his intention being to refute the Nestorians and the Monophysites.[79]

The claim that the eleventh-century Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, has distorted this and other books of the Maronites is without historical foundation. Assemani produces no concrete evidence to explain how and when Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, distorted Maronite books. The copy of the *Exposition of the Faith* which Assemani claims was distorted by Tuma is the oldest one known. Assemani sets the transcription date of this manuscript (Vatican Syriac MS 146) in the year 1392. The other copies of this manuscript—one at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and two at the Maronite Patriarchate in Bkerki—are of much later dates than this one. The prefaces to these three copies contain the same passage, and in addition the name of Anthimus is mentioned in the preface of the Vatican copy. In fact, Maronite Bishop Yusuf Deryan produces evidence contradicting the allegation that Tuma has distorted the *Exposition of the Faith*. Deryan informs us that he found a copy of the manuscript in the village of Ashqut in Lebanon; it was imperfect both at the beginning and the end, and therefore, no date or author's name appears on it. Deryan states that this is the "only original" copy of the author's handwriting, and contains the many comments and revisions therein in the same script. He continues that "these comments and revisions are the work of one of the pioneer students of the Maronite school in Rome."[80] Deryan concludes that although the language of this anonymous student is colloquial, it is more sophisticated than the language of al-Qilaʿi and others.[81] This testimony by Bishop Deryan leaves no room for doubt that the comments and revisions in the *Exposition of the Faith* were made by one of the pioneer Maronite students of the Maronite school established in Rome in 1584. Of these pioneer students we can only single out Abraham Ecchellensis (d. 1664), whose distortion of the oldest copy of the *Exposition of the Faith* was later written down by other copyists. The copy which Deryan found was one of these copies.

A number of questions arise in regard to this matter. Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi and Assemani agree that Tuma was a Maronite,[82] so what reason would he have had for distorting Maronite books? It is incredible that Tuma distorted the Syriac text of the *Exposition of the Faith* while leaving the Arabic translation intact. Even more incredible is that from the seventh century to the eleventh century there is no mention of this John Marun or his writings, except for some dubious references to him in the preface of the book entitled *al-Huda (Nomocanon)* and in the preface of the *Exposition of the Faith*. Indeed, Assemani himself admits that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, was a Monothelite,[83] and since the Maronites were Monothelites in the eleventh century, it is

logical to assume that Tuma was a Maronite bishop of Kfartab, and as such had no reason to distort the literature of his own church.

Some Western writers question John Marun's authorship of the *Exposition of the Faith* and believe the work was plagiarized.[84] They state, with justification, that there is nothing in the available copies of this work to prove that it was written by John Marun except for a reference in the preface which has been interpolated by copyists, all of whom are Maronites. More damaging to the claim of John Marun's authorship is the fact that the testimonies cited in the *Exposition of the Faith* cannot be dated later than the middle of the sixth century, and they contain no reference to Monothelitism, which emerged as an official doctrine early in the seventh century. Furthermore, the author mentions only four ecumenical councils, including the Council of Chalcedon assembled in 451. It is reasonable to assume that if the author were John Marun, presumably the defender of the doctrine of the two natures and two wills in Christ, he should at least have cited the decisions of the Sixth Council (680) which condemned Monothelitism and established the doctrine of two wills in Christ, confirming the transactions of the Council of Chalcedon. The claim that John Marun wrote the *Exposition of the Faith* before the Sixth Council was convened, when he was still a priest or a bishop, and the reference to him as a patriarch in the preface are most likely an interpolations by a copyist.[85] We shall see later that John Marun and his followers did not accept the Sixth Council.

The testimonies cited by the author of the *Exposition of the Faith* misled Rev. F. Nau into believing that in many respects this book resembles a similar book by a sixth-century theologian, Leontius of Byzantium.[86] The similarity between the two texts is accidental because it was the custom of many writers in the sixth and seventh centuries to copy the sayings and doctrinal opinions of earlier church fathers. The Reverend Nau's analogy is important in that it demonstrates that the *Exposition of the Faith* could not have been written earlier than the middle of the sixth century.[87] But the problem with Rev. Nau's equating the *Exposition of the Faith* with a work by Leontius of Byzantium is that Leontius defended the Council of Chalcedon and its formula of faith against the Monophysites, who professed *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. He did not discuss the question of one or two wills in Christ because that subject had not yet become a doctrinal issue; the author of the *Exposition of the Faith* quoted Monophysite writers as his authorities—the very writers whom Leontius of Byzantium contested. Furthermore, the *Exposition of the Faith* clearly reveals that its author was a Monothelite who, though he wrote the book after 680, never

mentions the Sixth Council assembled in that year to condemn Monothelitism. This is demonstrated by the following passage he wrote on the Trinity: "We the sons of the holy catholic church do confess and believe what we have received from the Prophets, the Apostles and the holy doctors who were renowned for their true faith and fought the good fight in the four Councils against those whom we have mentioned."[88] This clearly shows that John Marun, if he were the author, has not mentioned the Sixth Council. It also indicates either that John Marun was a Monothelite who must have detested the council for condemning Monothelitism, or that he was not the author of the *Exposition of the Faith*. Indeed, we have evidence by an ancient Malkite writer, Theodore, bishop of Harran (d. 820), disciple of Saint John of Damascus, that the Maronites rejected the Sixth Council.[89]

The Monothelitism of the author of the *Exposition of the Faith* is further demonstrated by the following passage: "When we say Father, Son and Holy Ghost we proclaim three persons and confess and believe them to be one essence. Likewise when we say divinity and humanity we in fact confess one person, one son, one will and one authority."[90]

This would be decisive evidence that John Marun, if he were the author of the *Exposition of the Faith,* was a Monothelite. What is surprising though is that Abraham Ecchellensis, whom Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud accuses of distorting this work, must have forgotten to remove the phrase "one will" from this passage. Even if Ecchellensis had removed this passage completely it would have not altered the fact that John Marun was a Monothelite, because it is contained in the text which Rev. F. Nau translated into French from the Syriac Paris Codex.[91] This passage also refutes Assemani's claim that John Marun never mentioned Monothelitism (one will) in the *Exposition of the Faith*.[92] Assemani is incorrect in maintaining that, because he never mentioned Monothelitism, John Marun must have written this *Exposition of the Faith* prior to the meeting of the Sixth Council.

What confirms the opinion that the author of the *Exposition of the Faith* was an anti-Chalcedonian Syrian Orthodox is his endorsement of Saint Cyril's formula of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*. As quoted above, the author states: "We believe that one of the Trinity, the Word, is of one substance and nature with us except sin. He is in two natures, the divine and the human, one Son, one Lord, one Christ, and one Person. However, we do not decline to profess One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos as the holy Fathers have proclaimed."[93]

Obviously, the last phrase consists of the words of Saint Cyril of Alexandria. It is true that the author of the *Exposition of the Faith*

recognizes that Christ was "in two natures" in conformity with the theology of Pope Leo I, and as it was included in the final definition of the Council of Chalcedon; however, he retains the main doctrine of Saint Cyril of the one nature. This is the doctrine maintained by the "Monophysites" or "Jacobites." We may, then, deduce from this quotation that if the author were John Marun, he must have been sympathetic with the Syrians who professed this doctrine and found it not the least objectionable on purely doctrinal grounds to recognize the orthodoxy of their faith. Likewise, he would not have made such an admission of the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* in his writing unless he intended to refute it. Such an admission, as Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud states, demonstrates the "strong brotherhood between the Maronites and the Jacobites since ancient times, to the extent that Maronite books are replete with the names of Jacobite Fathers."[94] Dawud remarks also that in the *Exposition of the Faith* John Marun never challenged or refuted these "Jacobites," but rather challenged and refuted the Eutychians, whom the "Jacobites" condemn.[95] For this reason the author of this book produced a testimony by Severus of Antioch, whom he called a saint.[96] He also called those who professed the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* holy brethren He states: "Tell us holy brethren about this one nature you ascribe to Christ after the union (of His two natures) is it of one substance with the Father or not?"[97]

From the previous analysis of the *Exposition of the Faith* we may conclude that it could not have been written by a Monothelite, let alone by John Marun, the alleged first patriarch of the Maronites. Neither could it have been written by a strict "Diphysite" or Chalcedonian as the author's admission of the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* demonstrates. Moreover, the author could not have been completely a "Monophysite" because he defended the doctrine of two natures in Christ united in one person. While it is difficult to establish with certainty the identity of the author of this book ascribed to John Marun, it is plausible that the author of the *Exposition of the Faith* used a treatise by a Syrian Orthodox Church father which he attributed to John Marun. He also made many changes in the *Exposition of the Faith* to make it appear as if it were a genuine work written by John Marun, who defended the doctrine of two natures and two wills in Christ in opposition to the doctrine of one nature and one will (Monothelitism) in Christ.

18

Was John Marun a Canonized Saint?

SINCE ITS INCEPTION, Christianity has singled out holy and righteous persons as saints. However, when the church was divided over doctrinal issues, most particularly after the Council of Chalcedon (451), each church, both East and West, began the practice of recognizing its own saints to the exclusion of others. The Maronite Church, which came into existence in the eighth century, only recently has recognized John Marun as a saint. He is of particular importance to the Maronites since they consider him to be their first patriarch.

The claim of the Maronites of the sainthood of John Marun was challenged in the eighteenth century by the Roman Catholic (Uniate) Malkites in Syria.[1] In 1715 some of these Malkites denied that John Marun was a saint or that the Church of Rome had canonized him. There was support for this from some Latin missionaries in Syria who asserted that the Church of Rome had not proclaimed John Marun a saint. The Maronites complained to Rome that the Malkites had denied that the fifth-century ascetic Marun was a saint. The truth is that these Malkites only denied that John Marun, and not the ascetic Marun, was a saint. The issue was examined by the special council for combatting heresies, headed by Father Louis Maria Lucini (later a cardinal). The council recognized that the fifth-century ascetic Marun was a saint, although his sainthood had not been canonically established. However, the council, in a biography of Saint Antonius, found a person named

Marun who had been condemned by the Sixth Council (680) as a Monothelite "heretic," and he was presumed to have been the John Marun whom Maronites claim was their first patriarch.[2] This issue erupted once more in 1750 when the Uniate Malkite Patriarch Cyril Tanas (d. 1760) was accused of destroying a portrait of John Marun on the grounds that he had been a Monothelite heretic.[3] Again the Maronites complained to the pope that Tanas had destroyed a portrait of the fifth-century ascetic Marun. In a letter to Pope Benedict XIV, Tanas denies that he dishonored the image of the ascetic Marun whom he believes to be a saint, but says that another person destroyed the portrait of the ascetic Marun, whom he considered a heretic. Tanas could not have been so ignorant that he did not know that his church commemorated the fifth-century ascetic Marun on February 14 of each year.[4] In response to the Maronites' complaint, Pope Benedict XIV issued a bull on September 28, 1753, confirming only the sainthood of the ascetic Marun.[5] As a result of the pope's decree the altercation between the Maronites and the Uniate Malkites was quieted for several years, only to erupt once more in 1765. At this time a Uniate Malkite priest, Anton Sabbagh, wrote a letter concerning John Marun, in behalf of this congregation in Aleppo to Arsanius Shukri, Maronite bishop in that city. Sabbagh complained that the members of his congregation became disturbed upon hearing that the Maronites had proclaimed John Marun a saint when the Malkites considered him a Monothelite heretic. He requested the bishop to provide them with an official answer about John Marun or to produce a papal bull recognizing John Marun's sainthood.[6] Bishop Shukri did not respond immediately but did so when the issue became more heated after a Malkite priest attacked the Maronites—particularly by criticizing the Lenten sermon Bishop Shukri delivered praising John Marun as a saint. Shukri issued a statement on December 12, 1768, declaring that some Maronites (Assemani, for example), as well as some popes, had recognized the sainthood of John Marun.[7] From this statement we also learn that the clergy of other Roman Catholic (Uniate) churches in Aleppo, joined by the abbots of such Roman Catholic orders as the Jesuits, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Capuchins, became involved in the issue. The Roman Catholic clergy held a council in the year 1768 to discuss John Marun's sainthood. According to Shukri, all the participants except the Roman Catholic Malkites accepted the sainthood of John Marun.[8] But the Malkites, who apparently were dissatisfied with the resolution of this council, continued to attack the sainthood of John Marun; this we learn from a letter addressed by Malkite clergy to the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (Congregation for

the Propagation of Faith).[9] This congregation had been concerned about the trouble between the Maronites and the Malkites over John Marun's sainthood since it became a heated issue in 1768. On April 9 of that year, the congregation wrote a letter to Maronite Patriarch Yusuf Istefan (d. 1793), asking him to provide testimonies supporting the sainthood of John Marun. This letter prompted the patriarch and Istefan Awwad Assemani to write treatises in defense of the Maronites and their saints and also provide the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide with testimonies proving the sainthood of John Marun.[10] Although the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide received these books and testimonies, it did not respond, perhaps because it was not convinced that there was evidence to determine whether the Church of Rome had recognized John Marun's sainthood or canonized him as a saint. All the Church of Rome did occurred on January 30, 1820, almost half a century after the controversy began in Aleppo, when Pope Pius VII offered full indulgence to all believers who visit the Church of John Marun in Kfarhayy during a festival in his honor on March 2 of each year. In 1821 this indulgence was extended to all who visit the church of John Marun or any other Maronite church.[11]

Was John Marun a recognized saint? If he was, did the Church of Rome canonize him? Some Maronites, particularly Patriarch Yusuf Istefan, provide evidence to prove that John Marun was a saint. They maintain that in their ritual books and liturgies he is referred to as a saint, that the Maronite Church commemorates him on February 9 of each year, that his picture is mounted along with the pictures of other saints in Maronite churches, that Maronite writers have always referred to him as a saint, and finally that several popes (particularly Pope Benedict XIV) ordered that John Marun be honored as a saint.[12]

We have seen that John Marun was mentioned as a saint in the so-called ancient Maronite books like the *Exposition of the Faith* and in the liturgy ascribed to John Marun. We have also demonstrated that these books were not written by John Marun. Patriarch Yusuf Istefan also cites such Maronite writers as al-Qilaʿi and al-Duwayhi to prove Marun's sainthood. But all that al-Qilaʿi and al-Duwayhi did was to quote a highly dubious and unauthenticated source which al-Qilaʿi describes as an ancient book containing the life story of John Marun.[13] We have demonstrated that this source has no historical validity or foundation. Istefan also claims that John Marun is described as a saint in the Maronite Calendar, which commemorates him on February 9.[14] This is hardly convincing; there is no evidence that the Maronite Church ever commemorated John Marun on February 9. The Maronite Calendar

published in 1622 mentions a commemoration on February 9 of only one Marun, described as the "Patriarch Marun." The term "patriarch" in this context should not mislead us to believe that it was meant for the John Marun whom Maronites claim as their "first patriarch." Indeed, Vatican MSS 27 and 28, which Istefan quotes, expressly fix the commemoration of the Anba (father) Marun who can be no other than the fifth-century ascetic Marun on February 9.[15] The term "patriarch" in this context is no more than that of Anba or father. The fact that the term Anba appears in the manuscript form of this calendar is an indication that the author deliberately replaced the term Anba with patriarch in order to make it appear to be John Marun, the "Patriarch."[16]

Another bit of evidence Istefan produces to establish that John Marun was a saint is the mention of his sainthood in the preface to the Maronite Missal published in Rome in 1716.[17] Perhaps Istefan overlooked the face that the Maronite Missal, published more than one hundred years earlier (1594), mentions only the name of Anba Marun, who is recognized as a saint by the Church of Rome, and that no mention is made of the sainthood of John Marun.[18] On the contrary, this same missal cites as a saint Barsauma, the chief ascetic, at a time when he was the arch-opponent of the Council of Chalcedon and who, according to Maronite claims, should be counted not as a saint but as a heretic. It is interesting that the name of Barsauma does not appear in this 1716 edition of the missal.[19]

Istefan further cites as evidence of John Marun's sainthood the fact that his portrait has had a place in the churches since ancient times and that it was always mounted among the portraits of other saints.[20] Istefan bases his evidence on al-Duwayhi's statement in which he claims that he personally saw portraits of John Marun in two Maronite churches in Lebanon hanging with portraits of the thirteenth-century Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti. According to al-Duwayhi, a caption under the portrait of John Marun reads "Saint John Marun, patriarch of Antioch." This portrait has been reproduced and distributed all over the world by order of the Apostolic See of Rome.[21] Istefan's evidence is untenable. The printing of portraits and pictures of clergy men by the Apostolic See of Rome does not validate the sainthood of a person; the Apostolic See of Rome has published many portraits and pictures of prominent lay and clergymen, without their having been canonized.[22] However, upon careful scrutiny of the two portraits of John Marun and al-Amshiti one cannot fail to recognize that they are identical, and that they were portrayed by the same artist with a slight difference.

Lastly, Istefan claims that Pope Urban VIII established the sainthood of John Marun, but there is no historical evidence to support this claim.[23] Such evidence as Istefan cites only proves (as in the case of Pope Benedict XIV), that the Apostolic See of Rome admits the holiness of the fifth-century ascetic Marun, not that it has officially accepted the holiness of the sainthood of John Marun.

The mid-eighteenth-century dispute between the Malkites and the Maronites of Aleppo over the sainthood of John Marun caused Pope Benedict XIV to address a letter to R. P. Nicolaus Lercari, secretary of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, in which he expresses his views on this matter.[24] From this letter we learn that the pope was displeased with Cyril Tanas's tearing the portrait of Saint Marun, describing the act as "irreligious." But throughout the letter the pope maintained the belief that Tanas had torn the portrait of the fifth-century ascetic Marun, whose holiness the pope recognized. In the letter there is a sharp distinction drawn between the fifth-century ascetic Marun, whose sainthood had been accepted by the Church of Rome, and John Marun, the Monothelite "heretic." The pope states that in his bull of August 12, 1744, he was following in the footsteps of his predecessor, Pope Clement XII, in offering complete indulgence to all the faithful men and women who confess their sins and take holy communion on February 9 to celebrate the memory of their personal patron.[25] As to John Marun, he refers to the statements of Sa'id Ibn Batriq and William of Tyre, which related that John Marun was a Monothelite and that he and the Maronites were steeped in the Monothelite heresy. However, the pope does not personally refute these statements but rather refers to such Maronite writers as Assemani and Faustus Nairon, who he says have refuted the errors of Ibn Batriq and William of Tyre. Benedict seems to believe that if Sa'id Ibn Batriq's hypothesis was correct, there were two Maruns, one a saint and the other a heretic. Using this hypothesis, he concludes that the Marun of Ibn Batriq was a heretic, while the Marun about whom Theodoret of Cyrus writes is a saint and therefore merits great honor. That Pope Benedict XIV had always in the mind the sainthood of the ascetic Marun, not John Marun, is evident from the following passage in his letter.

> Wherefore the efforts of our venerable brother Patriarch Cyril appear manifestly irreligious since under the intent of suppressing the veneration of Maro the heretic, whom Eutychius cites, he actually attacked the Catholic Maro who is mentioned by Theodoret. Moreover the Holy See in its pronouncements has always acknowl-

> edged the veneration of that blessed Abbot Maro of whom Theodoret writes, and the Holy See has prescribed his veneration by others.[26]

Commenting on this passage Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud states that it is not possible that the Apostolic See of Rome would institute the sainthood of an unknown person (meaning John Marun) whose religious doctrine was doubtful, and that writers are unanimous that he was the "head of a sect separated from the Catholic as well as the Eastern Churches and who always was denounced as a heretic."[27] Dawud concludes that the Church of Rome does not institute the sainthood of a person without its having been universally recognized in both East and West.[28] What Dawud attempts to say is that even if the See of Rome wanted to institute the sainthood of John Marun, it could not have done so because there was no basis for canonization.

In the light of the historical evidence discussed thus far, we may conclude that while the Church of Rome recognizes the sainthood of the fifth-century ascetic Marun, it has never recognized the sainthood of John Marun. In fact, Assemani, who has written extensively on Eastern churchmen and has described some of them as saints, has not done so with John Marun. He makes one reference, and only one, to John Marun as a saint, but it is likely that this was unintentional.[29] What is important is that the Lebanese Council assembled in 1736 did not refer to John Marun as a saint and did not list him among the saint, as it had done with the ascetic Marun.[30]

The question is who John Marun really was. The story of John Marun already cited—his Frankish origin, his journey to Rome, his ordination as a bishop and later a patriarch of Antioch over the Maronites, and his writings of several books including a liturgy—has no historical foundation. The earliest historical sources discussed (particularly of Ibn Batriq) indicate that there was a person called John Marun, but that he was only an abbot of a monastery in Syria, not a bishop or a patriarch. He was a Monothelite, maintaining one will in Christ, and there is no evidence whatsoever that he wrote any book or liturgy. Beyond the statement of Ibn Batriq about this John Marun nothing is known except the story related by al-Qilaʿi. Indeed, from the beginning of the eighth century, when John Marun died (707), to the sixteenth century, when al-Qilaʿi produced his story about him, historical sources are dead silent on this John Marun. This fact convinced the eminent Orientalist Rev. J. B. Chabot to deny the very existence of John Marun.[31] Eusèbe Renaudot is correct in stating that "it is not even certain that there ever was a patri-

arch by that name."[32] He was most certainly not the leader of the "Maronite nation."[33] If we were to admit that John Marun ever existed, we must also acknowledge that an ordinary abbot of the Monastery of Marun could not have earned the status of a saint without distinguished scholarly or spiritual achievements.

19

The Relation of the Maronites to the Mardaites and the Jarajima

So far we have seen that when the Maronites emerged as a religious group in the seventh century they were coerced by Emperor Heraclius into accepting the formula of faith of Chalcedon with its Monothelitic connotation which Heraclius enforced as a measure toward preservation of the unity of the empire. Like the monks of the Monastery of Marun, the inhabitants of Hims, Manbij, and southern Syria also accepted the faith of Chalcedon with the same Monothelitic context. However, as a doctrine made official by the emperor, Monothelitism was confined to Syria proper, the homeland of the new converts, and did not yet spread into Lebanon or the neighboring countries. The earliest reliable sources, especially the chronicle of Dionysius Tal Mahri, indicate that in the middle of the eighth century the monks of the Monastery of Marun installed their first patriarch from within the monastery, but none of the early patriarchs is cited by name. Tal Mahri gives the impression that the new converts to Monothelitism found it propitious to assert their ecclesiastical independence from the main body of the patriarchate of Antioch. Whether these converts belonged to the Malkite or "Jacobite" groups of this patriarchate is not important at this juncture; what is important is that the monks of the Monastery of Marun wanted ecclesiastical independence in order to be distinguished form these two groups. They were merely a religious group, not yet a full fledged denomination. Certainly they were not a "nation," the term used by al-Duwayhi perhaps

to indicate that the Maronites were a religious denomination. No historian, Syrian or otherwise, has referred to the Maronites as a denomination as early as the eighth century, or attributed to them the characteristics of a nation; this appellation was first used by seventeenth-century Maronites, particularly al-Duwayhi. In order to establish a separate identity for their church and community, seventeenth-century Maronites claimed not only that the Maronites were heirs to the Malkite Church and patriarchate but that they were the descendants of a warlike people called the Mardaites (Marada), who appeared for the first time in Syria and Lebanon in the seventh century. They claim that the Mardaites were a distinct people who possessed the characteristics of a nation and that the Maronites, who had also become a nation in that same century, were therefore none other than these same Mardaites.[1]

After relating his story about John Marun, al-Duwayhi states that John Marun finally became the "head of the Maronite nation."[2] How did John Marun achieve such a position, and who were the people who constituted the "Maronite nation?" Al-Duwayhi offers an explanation in relation to the occupation of Lebanon by the Mardaites who were dispatched to that country by Byzantine Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, in the year 676. According to al-Duwayhi, no sooner had John Marun been ordained a bishop than he began to travel from place to place to spread his faith. Within a short period of time he was able to convert many Monophysites, to such an extent that he found himself the head of a great flock. Al-Duwayhi states further that John Marun ruled not only over these new converts in Lebanon, but also over all the inhabitants of the countries from Armenia to Jerusalem. He quotes in this respect the chronicle of Theophanes (d. 818), the first to relate that in the ninth year of the reign of Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, (677) the Mardaites attacked Mount Lebanon and occupied all the country, from Black (al-Lukam) Mountain to Jerusalem. According to al-Duwayhi, these Mardaites were the Maronites under the jurisdiction of John Marun. Al-Duwayhi states the reason why these warlike people were called Mardaites or Marada (rebels) and not Maronites can be found in an ancient book transcribed by Jirjis, son of Dawud, son of Ibrahim, in 1315. He then relates in Syriac an incident which has no connection with either the Mardaites or the Maronites, neglecting to identify or offer any description of this ancient book, thus compelling us to discredit his account regarding this source.[3]

Father Henri Lammens also speaks of the "Maronite nation" and its spread into Lebanon, but he disassociates the Maronites from the Mardaites, whom he calls the Marada.[4] He is correct in recognizing that

the Maronites were Aramaic (Syriac-speaking) people living in Syria Secunda in the cities of Hims. Hama, and Shayzar. They also lived some distance to the north in Manbij, Qinnesrin, and the towns situated on the border line between the Arab and Byzantine states referred to as al-Awasim by the Arabs. In other words, the Maronites in the seventh century were still living in Syria proper and had not yet made the trek into Lebanon. Lammens could not determine the number of these Maronites and, from a debate between a group of Maronite and "Jacobite" churchmen (most likely monks) in the presence of Umayyad Caliph Muʿawiya Ibn Abi Sufyan (d. 680), he conjectures that they must have been of substantial number, or the caliph would not have decided the debate in their favor against their adversaries, the "Jacobites."[5] This debate, however, is irrelevant and is of no use in estimating the number of the Maronites.

Lammens affirms that the Maronites emigrated to Lebanon in the second half of the seventh century from the valley of al-Asi (Orontes) River in Syria, but he does not support his affirmation with historical evidence, again resorting to sheer speculation and conjecture. Realizing that he was on very shaky ground, Lammens anticipated the objections such generalized statements would encounter, and attempts to belay them in a passage in dialogue:

> Objector: Why do you speak of the immigration of the Maronites to Lebanon? Isn't it more appropriate to state that the indigenous inhabitants of Lebanon were none other than the Maronites?
>
> Lammens: Our first knowledge of the religious history of the Maronites demonstrates clearly that this denomination lived outside Lebanon. It has taken its name from Saint Marun who lived in north Syria [more correctly, the Maronites derived their name from the Monastery of Marun, not from Marun himself]. We have no evidence that the Maronites were ever in Lebanon. After some time, however, we find them emigrating from north and middle Syria to Mount Lebanon. Therefore, it is imperative to admit to the movement of the Maronite nation. Theophanes and the Muslim chronicler al-Baladhuri have indicated such movement by these people.
>
> Objector: But why did the Maronites leave their home in Syria to live in Lebanon?
>
> Lammens: They did that in order to escape the persecution of their neighbors, particularly their enemies the "Jacobites." These "Jacobites" were powerful and had control over Apamea in Syria Secunda. They had near that city a large monastery called the Monastery of Mar [Saint] Basus which accommodated six thousand

> three hundred monks. Because both the Maronites and the "Jacobites" were in disagreement with each other [over doctrinal issues], the Maronites were forced to leave their homeland.[6]

Lammens then attempts to demonstrate the alleged enmity between the Maronites and the "Jacobites" on the basis of the debate between the churchmen of the two groups in the presence of the Caliph Muʿawiya. He also demonstrates how, in the time of the Emperor Heraclius, the Maronites seized many churches and monasteries from the "Jacobites." He writes that these "Jacobites" attempted to restore their property in the time of the Caliph Muʿawiya but failed. Lammens speculates that for this reason they waited for an opportunity to antagonize the Maronites and force them out of their homes. As a result, the Maronites sought a safer and more peaceful abode in Mount Lebanon. Lammens also conjectures that perhaps these "Jacobites" destroyed the Monastery of Marun at this time. He continues to state that the emigration of the Maronites was not en masse but in small groups over long periods of time. At first these emigrants lived in north Lebanon and then spread throughout the country. He explains that the move took place at the time the Marada attacked Lebanon and the Maronites found protection under them. Lammens affirms that these Marada were the same people whom al-Baladhuri calls al-Anbat (Nabateans) and that they, along with another group (the Jarajima) and with many runaway slaves, joined the Byzantine army. Lammens states that al-Baladhuri labeled these Maronites al-Anbat to indicate their Aramaic (Syriac) origin.[7]

These statements by Lammens, except for the Anbat (Nabateans) being Aramaic-speaking people, are untenable. We have demonstrated earlier from the account of Tal Mahri, that the Maronites had been Syrian Orthodox "Jacobites" before they were forced to adopt Monothelitism in the formula promoted by Heraclius, and that after becoming Monothelites they separated themselves from the Syrian Orthodox "Jacobites" and seized many of their church buildings and monasteries. There is no evidence to support Lammens's view that the two groups antagonized each other to the extent that the Maronites finally emigrated to Lebanon in order to escape persecution by these Syrian Orthodox "Jacobites." In fact, there is no evidence that the Maronites ever moved from Syria to Lebanon, either en masse or in smaller separate groups. Moreover, Lammens's assertion that in the time of the Caliph Muʿawiya the "Jacobites" attempted but failed to recover from the Maronites the church buildings and monasteries they had lost in the time of Emperor Heraclius is untenable. Equally untenable is his statement that because

they had failed to recover their property, the "Jacobites" were always ready for opportunities to antagonize the Maronites, and for this reason the Maronites emigrated to Lebanon. We learn from the debate between the Maronite and Syrian Orthodox "Jacobite" churchmen that the "Jacobites" were the persecuted and the Maronites were the persecutors. If we can believe the authenticity of this debate, as written by a partisan Maronite monk, we learn that two Syrian Orthodox "Jacobites" bishops, Theodorus and Sabukht, appeared before Muʿawiya, the governor of Syria, in Damascus in June 970, of the Greeks (659 A.D.). Their purpose was to debate with a group of Maronite churchmen on matters of faith. According to the author of the text of this debate, the "Jacobites" lost the debate, which caused Muʿawiya to impose on them a tribute of twenty thousand dinars and to order them to hold their peace. From that time, the author informs us, the "Jacobite" bishops paid Muʿawiya a certain amount of gold annually in return for protection against persecution. This debate reveals the lamentable condition of the Christian church in Syria in the seventh century; in the words of Theodor Nöldeke, "the members of these churches prostituted themselves to their new Muslim rulers by accepting them as arbiters in matters of faith."[10] It seems that the unfortunate doctrinal squabbles among the Eastern Christians in the fifth and sixth centuries never abated under their new Muslim rulers, who were not the least concerned about doctrines or faith, as long as they paid the tribute or embraced Islam.

Lammens's claim that the "Jacobites" caused the destruction of the Monastery of Marun is groundless. It contradicts the assertion of the Maronites that this monastery was totally destroyed by the Byzantine army in 694, for reasons discussed by al-Duwayhi.[11] It also contradicts Lammens's own statement that the monastery was destroyed in the ninth century which, as he claims, forced its monks and their neighbors to emigrate to Lebanon. In the same content Lammens quotes al-Masʿudi, who stated that the Monastery of Marun was destroyed in his time (the tenth century) as a result of the continuous raids of the Bedouin Arabs and the tyranny of the Sultan.[12] As to the Anbat (Nabateans) who followed the army of the Marada, we cannot agree with Lammens that they were the Maronites; Lammens is only speculating when he makes the claim that al-Baladhuri meant that the Anbat were the Maronites. While it is true that the Anbat or Nabateans were a branch of the Aramaic people and spoke a dialect of the Aramaic-Syriac language, no historian has ever equated them with the Maronites.[13] Since there is no evidence that the Maronites emigrated to Lebanon either en masse or separately, how can we vouch for the testimony of the Syrian Maphrian of the East

Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286) who, while discussing Theophile Ibn Tuma, the chief astrologer of the Abbasid Caliph al-Mahdi (775–785), states that Theophile was a Maronite and that the Maronites were one of the Christian *madhahib* (creeds or sects) in Lebanon.[14] There must have been a separate Maronite sect in Lebanon in the eighth century to which Theophile belonged. How the Maronites got into Lebanon is not hard to explain if we realize that conversion from one religious group to another within the Syrian Church had been the commonplace result of doctrinal disputes since the fifth century; many Syrians became Nestorians, Chalcedonians, Malkites, or otherwise. It is not surprising then to find a group of indigenous Lebanese members of the Syrian Orthodox Church turning Maronite by their acceptance of the doctrine of Monothelitism, already an essential part of their belief in the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos,* although it was not officially recognized as a separate doctrine before the first half of the seventh century. It is also not unlikely that some Malkites accepted Monothelitism and became Maronites. In fact, the language, church rituals, and religious traditions of all Syrian peoples were identical until the middle of the fifth century, when divisions arose over the definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon. After this council the different rituals of the Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian groups can be more readily identified by respective emphasis on the "diphysite" theology of Chalcedon or the "monophysite" theology of those who rejected Chalcedon. We shall see later that historical evidence indicates that the majority of the inhabitants of Lebanon were Syrian Orthodox and spoke the Aramaic-Syriac language. It is more logical to believe that a segment of this Syrian Orthodox Church became Maronite and formed the Maronite Church and community in Lebanon than to maintain, as Lammens did, that the Maronites emigrated to Lebanon to escape persecution by the "Jacobites."

But the main problem here is not Lammens's speculation that the Maronites emigrated to Lebanon and encountered the indigenous Aramaic inhabitants there who, since they were of the same ethnic origin, quickly assimilated into their society.[15] The problem is whether the Maronites and the Mardaites (Marada) were one and the same people forming the "Maronite nation," as Maronites claim, and whether these Marada and the Jarajima (using al-Baladhuri's term) are one and the same people. It would, of course, be easier for us to follow the conclusion of eminent Orientalists such as Theodor Nöldeke, Father Henri Lammens, and Eastern writers such as Father Anastase Marie al-Karmali (d. 1947) and treat the Mardaites of Byzantine historian Theophanes and the Jarajima of al-Baladhuri as identical.[16] It would be easier like-

wise to agree with Professor M. Canard who, in his article entitled "Djaradjima" in the new edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam*,[17] follows the traditionally accepted theory that the Mardaites and the Jarajima are identical. In fact, this question would be less complex if it were not for the theory advanced by Maronite writers (including the renowned Joseph Assemani) since the seventeenth century: that the Mardaites were the ancestors of the present Maronite inhabitants of Lebanon.[18] However, no other Maronite has so zealously defended the theory that the Mardaites (Marada) and the Maronites were identical as Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, although he denies that the Mardaites and the Jarajima were the same people.[19]

The problem is complex and requires identification of these three groups in order to determine whether they are one. The first historian to mention the Mardaites was Theophanes. He states that in the year 669 the Mardaites attacked Lebanon and occupied portions of the country stretching from the Black Mountain to the holy city (Jerusalem). These Mardaites occupied the mountain tops of Lebanon and were joined by many slaves, both captive and native, and within a very short time their number increased to many thousands.[20] Theophanes continues that when Muʿawiya (the Ummayad Caliph Muʿawiya Ibn Abi Sufyan) and his advisors heard of these Mardaites they were much afraid. Believing that the Byzantine state was protected by divine providence, they sent delegates to Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus (668–685), to arrange peace with him and to promise to pay an annual tribute to him.[21] The emperor, it seems, received the delegates with alacrity and dispatched an elderly, rich, and experienced patrician named John to negotiate with Muʿawiya. John met with Muʿawiya and the council he had convened for this purpose, and they reached a peaceful settlement. According to the treaty of peace written and confirmed by oath, Muʿawiya was to pay the Byzantine state an annual tribute of 3,000 gold pieces, 8,000 slaves and 50 thoroughbred horses. Finally, we are told by Theophanes that the two parties concluded a firm peace for thirty years, both sides exchanging treaties, and that John returned to the emperor with magnificent gifts.[22] This may well be true, but Theophanes says nothing about who the Mardaites were, from whence they came, or why they were called Mardaites. What we can understand from Theophanes's statement is that the Mardaites were strong and valiant people who fought for the Byzantine emperor and controlled the area from the Black Mountain (al-Lukam or the Amanus Mountain) to Jerusalem, that there was no force to oppose or repel them, and that runaway slaves and even natives joined them for protection and assistance. This statement will be very important to our

discussion of the Jarajima. We also know that the Mardaites would have occupied most of Syria and probably a great part of the Near East at that time had they not been ordered by the Byzantine Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus (685–695), to evacuate Lebanon and settle in Armenia. There is a clear picture of how this event occurred. When Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwan became caliph in 685, Syria was undergoing famine and plague. The Mardaite raids in Lebanon increased the severity of the famine, and as a result many rebel groups arose, each faction attempting to overthrow Abd al-Malik. Abd al-Malik, who was beleaguered by rebellion and harassed by the attacks of the Mardaites,[23] followed the precedent of Muʿawiya and sought peace by sending an ambassador to negotiate with Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus. The outcome of the negotiations was that Abd al-Malik agreed to pay 365 pieces of gold annually and a like number each of slaves and thoroughbred horses. The Mardaites, however, encouraged by the new Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, continued to harass the Arabs in Syria, impelling Abd al-Malik to send an ambassador to reinforce the previously concluded peace. A new ten-year peace treaty was made in which the Byzantine emperor undertook to evacuate the army of the Mardaites from Lebanon and to block their future invasion, laments Theophanes, "destroying with his own hands the brass wall which was standing in Lebanon."[24] Abd al-Malik on his part was to provide the emperor each day with a slave, a horse, and a thousand dinars. Furthermore, both parties agreed to divide equally the tax revenue of Cyprus, Armenia, and Iberia. The emperor, we are told, honored the agreement and drove twelve thousand Mardaites from Lebanon. The Mardaite invasion of Syria must have been devastating for, in the words of Theophanes, the territory from Mopsuestia (al-Massisa) to the fourth Armenia became desolate because of the incursion.[25] The peace with the Byzantine emperor, and most particularly the evacuation of the Mardaites from Lebanon, must have given Abd al-Malik a peaceful interim in which to deal with the rebels one by one until all were finally subdued.[26]

Father Lammens recognizes the complexity of the problem of determining the origin of the Mardaites. In his articles on the Mardaites, he gives the different ideas which throw light on the origin of these people. He quotes Theophanes's statement that the Mardaites attacked and occupied Lebanon, and concludes that for this reason they were not Lebanese but foreigners. He again quotes Theophanes that these Mardaites were joined by natives and again reinforces his conclusion that the Mardaites were not Lebanese. Lammens goes on to say that historians who mentioned the Mardaites always defined them as *tagmata,* or regi-

ment, and that this proves that they were not civilians but a military group, with military organization and discipline. In time of peace they made their living by farming, although they were always ready to go to war. In this regard they are similar to the Croations in the eighteenth century who protected the southern borders of Austria. They also resemble the *limitanei* forces which the Romans stationed at the borders to protect their empire. These *limitanei* were usually recruited from professional soldiers who in time of peace were given land to cultivate. Upon a soldier's death, his land passed to his sons, who followed in his father's footsteps and enlisted in the *limitanei.*[27] Lammens also quotes French writers such as Anquetil Duperron and Rambaud, who maintained that either the Mardaites were an ancient people who for many generations migrated from place to place until some finally settled on the northern borders of Lebanon, or that they were originally an Iranian tribe which over the years became mixed with Syrian and Armenian elements.[28] Lammens rejects the idea advanced by Father Martin in his history of Lebanon that the Mardaites were Arabs and that their name was derived from *tamarrud* (rebellion); Lammens's rejection is made on the ground that the Mardaites came neither from the Arabian peninsula nor from the east but entered Lebanon from the north, possibly coming from Asia Minor. He also states that there is no evidence that the Arabs entered Lebanon in the seventh century. Yet like other modern writers in Arabic he writes the name of these people as Marada with a fatha vowel over the R.[29] Ancient Arab writers did not know the term Marada, and it is our believe that it is of Syriac origin as shall be seen later.

Since the seventeenth century Maronite writers have claimed that the Mardaites and the Maronites are one and the same people. They cite as evidence that the Mardaites (Marada) were Christians living in Lebanon in the seventh century and that they are the only Christians known to be living there at that time; moreover, the Marada were fighting the Malkites in the seventh century, and there was no one in Lebanon fighting the Malkites at that time except the Maronites. The Maronites were therefore the Marada or Mardaites. To the objection that the Mardaites were a military group dispatched by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, to attack the Muslims in Syria, Maronites reply that if the Mardaites were a military group they would have left Lebanon soon after the conclusion of peace with the Muslims in 677. Historians, however, mention that despite this peace agreement the Mardaites continued their incursion in Syria until 685, when Abd al-Malik sued for peace and, with certain conditions, Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, agreed to evacuate the Mardaites from Lebanon and station them in Armenia.[30] In support

of the opposing view that the Mardaites were foreigners and not Maronites, we refer to Dionysius Tal Mahri, who states that "these Maridoye (Mardaites or Marada) always came to plunder, and it is for this reason that they were dispatched by the Byzantines."[31] Making the matter even more complex is the conclusion of Father Lammens that after studying the activities of the Jarajima, he came to believe that they were the Marada or Mardaites. He agrees with Theodor Nöldeke that the Arab historians called the Mardaites "Jarajima," and concludes that the Mardaites were not the Maronites.[32] It is sufficient to note here that the first to challenge the opinion of Maronite writers maintaining that the Mardaites were the ancestors of the Maronites was the Roman Catholic syrian Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud. In his *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj al-Rahina fi Ibtal Daʿawa al-Mawarina,* he states:

> Ancient historians mentioned that in the seventh century a group of people who spread and became well known in the Western parts of Syria, and were called the Mardaites, came from the land of the Rum [Byzantines] to repulse the Muslim Arabs, who were in possession of Syria, to fight them and prevent them from invading the country [Byzantium]. This led Maronite learned men from Murhij Nirun [Faustus Nairon] to Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs to believe that these Mardaites were ancestors of the Maronites, that the name Marada is derived from the Syriac or Arabic "Muruda" [the state of being rebellious], that they were adversaries of the Byzantine emperors in Syria, and that the followers of these emperors were called Malkites because of their encounter with the Mardaites. Assemani himself has with all seriousness claimed this in different places in his writings following those [writers] who preceded him. But he disagreed on one point with Murhij Nirun and those who followed him. While these [writers] considered the [Mardaites] an orthodox [holding the same faith as that of the Roman Catholic Church] religious sect and considered their adversaries the Malkites heretical Monothelites, Assemani claimed that the reason for the quarrel and the animosity between the Mardaites and their adversaries was not religious, but secular. Apparently the eminence of this learned man has deceived many of the European scholars who did not take the trouble to investigate this question, but rather held his view.[33]

After quoting Theophanes's account of the Mardaites, Dawud concludes that the Mardaites were not the Maronites on the grounds that they attacked Lebanon from the outside and therefore were strangers, not native Lebanese. He adds that the Maronites have always been known by this name because of their religious persuasion, which was

different from that of their neighbors.[34] What Dawud meant by the Maronite religious persuasion is their adherence to the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism). This doctrine was promoted, as we have noted, by Emperor Heraclius in order to reach a compromise between the disputants in the empire over the "two natures" and "one nature" of Christ. As is well known, this quarrel not only rocked the foundation of the church but the foundation of the state as well. Furthermore, Dawud argues, the Mardaites were evacuated from Lebanon in 685 and were settled in Armenia, but there is no evidence that Armenia ever had a Maronite population. Dawud rejects the view that the Mardaites were the Maronites also because of their enmity toward the Byzantine emperors. It is obvious, he says, that the Mardaites were not the enemies of these emperors, but were their subjects and soldiers; in fact, one of Abd al-Malik's stipulations for his conclusion of peace with Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, was that the emperor should evacuate the Mardaites from Lebanon. This clearly indicates that the Mardaites were the emperor's men and that he had jurisdiction over them. To further support this view Dawud states that the Mardaites had no adversaries called the Malkites and that historians who discuss the Mardaites never mention them in connection with the Malkites or Maronites. Even if one were to agree with Maronite writers that the Mardaites fought the Muslim Arabs in defense of Christianity, the source of enmity between them and the Muslim Arabs should have been solely a religious one, or to put it into more specific terms, it should have been a war between Christianity and Islam, but this was not the case.[35] It is also obvious that at the time of the Arab conquest of Syria in 636, there were no warlike people in that country antagonistic to the Byzantine state. Moreover, there is no contemporary mention of the activities of the Maronites at that date until the eighth century, when Theophanes became the first to relate that the Mardaites attacked Lebanon in 669. From this date until their evacuation in 685, we hear of no military group fighting for the Byzantine emperors against the Mardaites. Obviously, the opinions of Maronite writers in this regard are sheer fantasy.[36] Finally, Dawud suggests that most probably the name "Mardaite" is derived from the Persian word Mard (a man or valiant). Apparently, these valiant men, the Mardaites, guarded the borders of the Byzantine empire against Persian incursions; they fought against the Persians so militantly that the Persians called them Mardan, or valiant men. In conclusion, Dawud blames Assemani for suppressing the truth in his identification of the Maronites with the Mardaites. "It is not after all surprising," censures Dawud, "that despite his knowledge of the conditions of the Mardaites, Assemani has agreed with those (writ-

ers) who claim that they (the Mardaites) were originally Maronites or Lebanese and were adversaries of the Byzantine kings (emperors)."[37]

Father Anastase Marie al-Karmali (d. 1947) is of the opinion that the Mardaites were not the Maronites. He presents this view in an article entitled "al-Marada aw al-Jarajima," which appeared in *al-Mashriq* in 1903. Al-Karmali begins by stating he is a genuine Maronite who would do everything in his power to defend his sect. He had long been under the impression that the Mardaites and the Maronites are one and the same people, but when he read Father Lammens's article about the Mardaites in *al-Mashriq,* he realized that by a single stroke of a pen Father Lammens had destroyed "an indestructible edifice which our forefathers established with a great deal of sweat."[38] Al-Karmali confesses that he became both greatly disappointed and infuriated because of Lammens's views, but when he calmed down and regained his composure, he began investigating this question objectively. He started by reading the writings of ancient Arab authors, hoping that they had thoroughly described the conditions of the countries they conquered and the peoples they dominated. He discovered, however, that the Arab authors said nothing about the Mardaites. This surprised him since, as he correctly maintains, Arab authors mentioned many other peoples, such as the Kurds, whom the Arabs fought, and about whose tribes and tribal organization they provided a detailed description. Persian writers did not provide this information, even though they were neighbors of the Kurds. Al-Karmali discovered that Arab authors had provided a full account of a people whom they called the Jarajima, whose conditions and affairs are very similar to those of the Mardaites. Later his search led him to Theophanes's account of the Mardaites, after which he began to draw conclusions not very different from those of Father Lammens. Al-Karmali concludes that the inhabitants of Syria at the time of the Arab conquest knew nothing about the Marada (he writes the name following the Arabic spelling which Lammens also used); that the name Mardaites was coined by Byzantine authors; that furthermore, all of the Syrian and Arab authors borrowed this name from the Byzantines; and that modern writers have called them Marada. Moreover, before they came to Lebanon, these Marada, who were originally Medes, had for many generations lived in the territory south of the Caspian Sea and were subjects of the Medo-Persian state and later of Alexander the Great. The country of their origin covers approximately the present territory of Mazandaran, that is, the area between Gilan and Tabaristan in Persia. They were warlike, fighting men, accustomed to invade and plunder; hence their name in Persian is Mardan (singular, Mard). Finally al-Karmali holds that the

Mardaites and the Jarajima are the one and the same. he also reaches, but independently, the same conclusion as Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, that the Mardaites are not the Maronites.[39] Al-Karmali is incorrect, however, in maintaining that the inhabitants of Syria at the time of the Arab conquest of that country knew nothing about the Mardaites. He seems to contradict himself on this point when, at the end of his article, he produces an observation by the Syrian historian Bar Hebraeus, showing clearly that the Syrians knew the Mardaites, whom they called *Maridoye* (Mardaites or Marada) and *Gargumoye* (Jarajima), as shall be seen later.[40]

So far we have shown the different views regarding the Mardaites and the conclusions of modern writers that the Mardaites were not the Maronites of Lebanon. We have also shown that some modern writers consider the Jarajima, whose conditions and activities were similar to those of the Mardaites, to be identical with the Mardaites. It is of importance to identify the Jarajima and the evidence adduced by modern writers to support their views.

According to al-Baladhuri (d. 892), in his *Futuh al-Buldan* (The Conquest of Countries), the Jarajima were the inhabitants of Jarjuma, a city in the Mount al-Lukam (the Black Mountain or the Amanus) between Bayyas and Buqa.[41] Father Lammens, however, identifies the Jarjuma as a small kingdom which existed in the ninth century B.C. in the northwestern part of Syria, its capital being Marʿash (Germanicia). He also maintains that the people of this kingdom were not Aramaeans because the Aramaean state did not extend to cover the area of this kingdom. He adds that the term "Jarajima" is mentioned in Assyrian writings, which are replete with information about the affairs of these people. Lammens goes on to say that since the Syrian era, no mention was made of the Jarajima until the eighth century, when historians mentioned the Mardaites for the first time.[42] However, after studying al-Baladhuri's account of the Jarajima, Father Lammens discovered that there is a similarity between the affairs of the Mardaites and those of the Jarajima. In point of fact, Theophanes's report about the movement of the Mardaites from north to south Syria, their conquest of Lebanon, and their settlement near Hims, Baʿlbak, and Damascus is almost identical with al-Baladhuri's account of the Jarajima at the time when the Umayyad Caliph Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwan was about to leave for Iraq to fight Musʿab Ibn al-Zubayr. Al-Baladhuri states that when Abd al-Malik was ready to depart, a Byzantine cavalry company (which he calls Khayl al-Rum) marched with its leaders on to Mount al-Lukam and then into Lebanon, where they were joined by a multitude of the Jarajima, Anbat

(Nabateans), and slaves who had escaped from the Muslims. Abd al-Malik, fearing the Byzantine emperor might seize the opportunity to attack Syria, followed the precedent of Muʿawiya and concluded a peace with the emperor. As a result the Jarajima were scattered in the cities of Hims and Damascus, while a greater number of them returned to their city in Mount al-Lukam.[43] His account, to be sure, is very similar to that given by Theophanes about the Mardaites, who after the conclusion of this peace returned to their home in Syria. This similarity however, does not indicate that the Mardaites and the Jarajima are the same people.

We learn further from al-Baladhuri that the Jarajima were Christians and that since the Arab conquest of Syria they had created a great deal of trouble for the Arabs, but there is no information concerning their church or denomination. the conquering Arabs must have realized the importance of these Jarajima in the struggle against the Byzantines and thus attempted to pacify them. When the Arab commander Habib Ibd Maslama al-Fihri conquered the Jarjuma, its inhabitants asked him for peace and he granted it to them with the condition that in return for being exempt from paying the poll tax they should act as spies for the Muslims. However, the Jarajima were not totally loyal to the Muslims; sometimes they were with them and sometimes with the Byzantines. In the time of Caliph Abd al-Malik the Jarajima joined the Mardaites against the Arabs but were pacified when Abd al-Malik signed a peace treaty with the Byzantines as shown earlier. In the year 89 A.H. (A.D. 707) the Umayyad Caliph al-Walid, son of Abd al-Malik (705–715), wanted to subdue the Jarajima who remained disloyal to the Arabs. He sent his brother Maslama, who occupied the city of Jarjuma but granted its inhabitants the freedom to settle anywhere in Syria. In order to secure their loyalty he assured them that no tribute would be imposed on them and that neither they, their wives, nor their children would be forced to abandon Christianity, but he did demand that they fight with the Muslims. He also provided them and their families with food and eight dinars for each one of them. Lastly, al-Baladhuri states that Maslama destroyed the city of Jarjuma, evacuating its inhabitants and settling them in the Huwwar Mountain in present-day Cilicia, al-Lulun (al-Baladhuri's spelling), and in the lowland in Tizin. Some of them settled in Hims, while their patrician and a group of his men went to Antioch, later escaping to the country of the Byzantines.[44] Al-Baladhuri does not state why Maslama destroyed Jarjuma, but it could be inferred that the inhabitants of that city were still disloyal to the Muslims, despite the favorable treatment given by Maslama, which finally led him to destroy it and free the Muslims of a source of trouble. Al-Baladhuri, however,

quotes a statement by al-Waqidi (d. 822), which gives the impression that some of the Jarajima settled in Lebanon. It relates that a group of people from Mount Lebanon complained against the tax collector of Baʿlbak, which led Salih Ibn Abd Allah Ibn Abbas to send a man to kill some of them. He allowed those who chose to retain their religious belief to do so and repatriated them to their villages. He also deported some of the people of Lebanon.[45] Father Lammens believes this shows clearly that there were some Jarajima in Lebanon. This, he believes, is not a matter of conjecture but an established fact, confirmed in an account by al-Baladhuri concerning a certain Maymun al-Rumi (the Byzantine), whose nickname—the Jarjumani—indicates that he belonged to the Jarajima. Al-Baladhuri states that Maymun was a Byzantine slave from the clan of Umm al-Hakam (the mother of al-Hakam and sister of the Umayyad Caliph Muʿawiya Ibd Abi Sufyan). Maymun associated himself with the Jarajima and accompanied them when they left Lebanon.[46] Lammens also concludes that the Mardaites were not the Maronites, and that the Jarajima and the Maronites were not the same people. However, he maintains that there was a strong bond between the Mardaites and the Maronites.[47] Al-Karmali reaches a similar conclusion, but he produces three new quotations: one from the Arabic lexicon *Taj al-Arus (The Bride's Crown)*, which defines the Jarajima as Persians from the Arabian Peninsula and equates them with the Anbat (Nabateans) of Syria; the second from *Kitab al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh (The Perfect in History)*,(4, 118), by Ibn al-Athir, which reports the rebellion of the Jarajima in Syria; and the third from *Muʿjam al-Buldan (The Dictionary of Countries)* (11, 55), by Yaqut al-Hamawi, which adds no significant information beyond that provided by al-Baladhuri.[48]

This is not the full account of the Jarajima and the Mardaites. Some modern Maronite writers have been dissatisfied with both the accounts of ancient Arab and Byzantine writers about the Jarajima and the Mardaites and with the observations of Father Lammens and al-Karmali. Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs wrote two articles in *al-Mashriq*, one entitled "al-Marada wa al-Mawarina," in which he attempted to refute Lammens's opinion regarding the Mardaites and the Jarajima,[49] and another entitled "Laysa al-Marada al-Jarajima," in which he sought to prove that the Mardaites were neither the Jarajima nor the cavalry of the Byzantine mentioned by al-Baladhuri. He did maintain that both the Mardaites and the Jarajima were Maronites.[50]

It would be both tedious and unnecessary to present al-Dibs's entire argument. Apart from his opinion that the Mardaites and the Jarajima were not the same people, most of the points he raises to prove

that the Mardaites and the Maronites are one and the same people are either superfluous or insignificant interpretations of the available historical facts on the subject.

Since all of the above-mentioned writers base their conclusion that the Mardaites of Theophanes and the Jarajima of al-Baladhuri are one and the same due to the similarity of their activities, it is appropriate to investigate the matter further. The author must admit that when he wrote on this subject in 1969 he concluded that the Mardaites of the Greeks and the Jarajima of the Muslim writers were one and the same people.[51] However, upon more careful study of the available Syriac source of Tal Mahri, as well as al-Baladhuri's account about the Jarajima, it was necessary to change this stand by agreeing with the Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs that the Mardaites and the Jarajima are not the same people.[52] However, he cannot agree with al-Dibs that the Jarajima were not the cavalry of the Byzantine or that they were the Maronites themselves.

Most of the writers who dealt with this subject were confused by the terms "Gargumoye" (used by Tal Mahri) and the "Jarajima" (used by al-Baladhuri) because of the similarity of both terms in the Arabic and Syriac languages. Further confusion was added when the writers detected some similarity between the activities of the Mardaites of Theophanes, the Gargumoye of Tal Mahri, and the Jarajima of al-Baladhuri. Such similarity in the accounts of these writers is obvious, but dissimilarities are present too, although they are not so obvious. Unlike Tal Mahri, al-Baladhuri identified the Jarajima as inhabitants of a city called the Jarjuma in al-Lukam (Theophanes's Black Mountain and Tal Mahri's Ukomo), clearly indicating that they were native Syrians, not foreigners. Al-Baladhuri claims these Jarajima were Christians who gave their allegiance to the Byzantine state and that the Muslims tried to win their loyalty but failed, finally destroying their city. Theophanes does not mention the Jarajima or their city. He simply states that a certain people called Mardaites attacked Lebanon and occupied the entire country. Up to this point the accounts of Theophanes and al-Baladhuri are not in the agreement; they do agree, however, on what occurred next. Theophanes states that these Mardaites were joined by many slaves, both captives and natives, so that within a very short time their number had increased to many thousands. Al-Baladhuri, on the other hand, states that a cavalry company of Byzantines with its commander marched into al-Lukam (Black) Mountain and then on to Lebanon. In their march the cavalrymen were joined by a great number of Jarajima, Anbat (Nabateans), and slaves who had run away from their

Muslim masters. The similarities between the two accounts in their context are obvious, and we may infer that the Mardaites of Theophanes are the same Byzantine cavalrymen (Khayl al-Rum) of al-Baladhuri. Of this opinion is Bishop Yusuf Deryan who, with his colleague Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, entered into heated argument over the origin of the Mardaites, Maronites, and the Jarajima. After citing the accounts of Theophanes and al-Baladhuri, Deryan concludes that if both writers are talking about the same events and the same people, it is possible that the Mardaites of Theophanes and the cavalry of al-Baladhuri are one and the same people.[53]

So far we have seen a partial reconciliation between the statements of Theophanes and al-Baladhuri, and that according to the latter the Jarajima were not the Mardaites, only having joined the Mardaites in their march against Lebanon throughout all the area stretching from al-Lukam Mountain to Jerusalem. However, there is a problem with Tal Mahri's Syriac source. Tal Mahri mentions the Mardaites and the Jarajima in a similar context, giving the impression at first that they are the same people. Tal Mahri states:

> In the ninth year of Constantine [Pogonatus], *rumoye* [soldiers], known as Maridoye [Mardaites or Marada], that is highway robbers, whom the Syrians called *Gargumoye* [in Arabic Jarajima] came to Mount Lebanon and occupied the area from the Mount of Galilee to Mount Ukomo [the Syriac word for black, that is, the Black or al-Lukam Mountain]. They always came out to plunder and for this purpose they were dispatched by the Romans [Byzantines] against Lebanon. Eventually, the Arabs overcame them, killing some and plucking out the eyes of others.[54]

It is evident from this quotation that the Syrians, not the Byzantines or the Arabs, first called these *Maridoye* (Marada or Mardaites) and *Gargumoye* (Jarajima). These Maridoye did not constitute a nation with definite ethnic characteristics, nor were they Romans or Byzantines. They were simply *rumoye,* a term which may sound like *Romans* but in colloquial Syriac meant "soldiers." In fact, the Syriac-speaking people of Tur Abdin even to this day use the terms *rumoyo* (singular) and *rumoye* (plural) in that sense.[55] These soldiers, to be sure, were employed by the Byzantine emperors in raids against the Arabs in Syria. According to the testimony of Tal Mahri, the inhabitants of Syria, including Lebanon, must have known them by these two names, although he says nothing about their origin. He says nothing either about the city of the Jarjuma or its natives, which al-Baladhuri mentions. The question remains

whether these Gargumoye of Tal Mahri are the same Jarajima of al-Baladhuri. The answer is that they probably were not. However, since the inhabitants of the Jarjuma must have been well known to the rest of the Syrians and since, according to al-Baladhuri, they joined the Byzantine cavalry who are none other than the Maridoye of Tal Mahri and the Mardaites of Theophanes, the Syrians mentioned them in association with these Mardaites. In other words, the Syrians, according to Tal Mahri, called the people who attacked and plundered Lebanon "Maridoye" (Mardaites) as well as "Gargumoye" (Jarajima) when they saw inhabitants of the city of the Jarjuma amongst the plunderers and those fighting the Arabs. It is also likely that Theophanes, who first mentioned the term "Mardaites" borrowed it from the Syrians because it was popular at that time in Syria. Surely the term "Mardaites" is not Greek, nor does it appear in Greek writings preceding those of Theophanes. Why Theophanes used the term "Mardaites," and not "Maridoye" as the Syrians did, is not hard to explain. One plausible explanation is that the term "Jarajima" (Gargumoye) was more popular in Syria proper, and particularly in al-Sham, where the Arabs were in closer contact with the Syrians, than among the inhabitants of the mountains of Lebanon where the term "Maridoye" or "Mardaites" (that is, highway robbers) was more popular because of continuous raids and plundering. It is also possible that Theophanes called them "Mardaites" because they were of Persian origin, or that they were given this nickname because of their warlike manner and predatory way of life.

Be that as it may, although Tal Mahri mentions that the Syrians knew the *Maridoye* (Mardaites) as *Gargumoye* (Jarajima), he did not mean that they were one and the same people. The Syrians, who did not identify the origin of these warlike people dispatched by the Byzantine emperor to fight the Arabs, called them *Maridoye* because of their ravaging and plundering. They also referred to them as *Gargumoye* when they saw that the inhabitants of the Jarjuma had joined them in their savagery. It is also evident in the Greek, Syriac, and Arabic sources we have discussed that these Mardaites and the Jarajima were soldiers in the service of the Byzantine emperors and fought against the Arabs. These sources mention nothing about the Maronites or make any associations with them. Perhaps the greatest problem of the historian dealing with this subject is the paucity of sources on the Mardaites and the Jarajima. According to some Arabic sources, the Jarajima settled in many parts of the Arab world but they give no explanation of how and when this happened. These Arabic sources are also silent on the origin of these Jarajima, so there is no way of knowing whether they came originally

from the city of Jarjuma in al-Lukam or the Black Mountain. We read in *Kitab al-Aghani (Book of Songs)* (16, 76), that the Jarajima were of Persian origin: "Banu al-Ahrar [sons of the Free, by whom the poet Umayya Ibn Abi al Salt (d.c. 630) in his poem, means Persian who came with Sayf Ibn dhi Yazan]. Today they are called Banu al-Ahrar in San'a, al-Abna in al-Yaman, al-Ahamira in al-Kufa al-Khadarima in al-Jazira and al-Jarajima in al-Sham [Syria]."

Certainly the sources we have discussed make no mention of the Maronites, and they do not identify them with either Mardaites or the Jarajima; yet the Maronites insist that the Mardaites were Maronites. Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, more than anyone, seriously believes and defends this theory. He states that the name "Mardaites" (he uses the Arabic form Marada, as Lammens and al-Karmali did) was given to the Maronites in the seventh century by their adversaries, and that Mardaites and the Maronites are one and the same people. He adds that some of the Christian inhabitants of lebanon were called Marada after they rebelled against the Byzantine emperor because he did not conform to the "Catholic" faith. Al-Dibs contends that the term "Marada" was used for the Maronites who fought against these Malkites, particularly Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, who fell into the Monothelite "heresy." At the beginning the two terms were used alternately to signify a regular objective in the same way as the term "Qaysite" and "Yamanite" signified civil dichotomy between these two Arab tribes. In other words, the Maronites and the Malkites were people who belonged to the same church but who formed separate groups in the time of Emperor Heraclius who promoted the Monothelite "heresy" in Syria. This Monothelite "heresy" reached its climax in the time of Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, who embraced that doctrine. The Maronites who rejected the "heresy" rebelled against the Emperor and against the Arabs and for this reason their neighbors and enemies called them rebels (Marada) from the Syriac verb *Mrad* (to revolt). Al-Dibs states that to identify these Marada or Mardaites with the ancient Persian Mards, as some writers did, is a sheer fantasy.[56]

What al-Dibs is saying in fact is that the Maronite inhabitants of Lebanon were Syrians (Aramaeans) who adhered to the "Catholic" faith formulated by the Council of Chalcedon (451). By adopting this faith they became orthodox adherents of the faith professed by the Church of Rome and could not be accused of being "heretics" or adherents to the Monothelite "heresy." It is because of this "Catholic" faith that the first Maronite patriarch, John Marun, was persecuted by the Byzantine emperor. This theory, which is advanced by Maronite Bishop Jabra'il al-

Qila'i and expanded by Maronite writers from the seventeenth century onward to justify the attachment of the Maronites to the Church of Rome, has no historical foundation. We discussed it earlier in chapters fifteen and sixteen on John Marun.[57] We shall see, too, when we discuss the relation of the Maronites with the Church of Rome that the Church of Rome does not agree with this view. Joseph Assemani, who iterates the opinions of such Maronite writers as Faustus Nairon and Istefan al-Duwayhi, writes that these two claims that the term Malkite was counter to the term Mardaites. He comments that the truth is that these two names signify not two religious groups, but rather warlike groups. He explains that those who fought on the side of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, were called Malkites (the King; in Syriac, Malko, that is, the imperial party), and those who fought against him were called Mardaites (that is, rebellious).[58] This is indeed a fantastic theory; we have already seen that the Mardaites fought for Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, with whom the Umayyad Caliphs Mu'awiya and Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwan concluded a peace treaty. There is no historical evidence that the Malkites were considered Monothelite "heretics" or that the Mardaites were ever considered orthodox. It is evident from the testimony of Assemani that the Maronites were not a secular but a religious sect. Assemani contradicts himself when he states that the term Malkite was not mentioned by ancient Romans until the tenth century A.D.; in the same work he affirms that the same Malkites fought for Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, in the seventh century. Indeed, no ancient historian has associated the Mardaites with the Malkites or with the Maronites. We have already seen from the different testimonies of the Syrian Patriarch of Antioch Dionysius Tal Mahri that the Maronites were a group of monks belonging to the Monastery of Marun. They were called Maronites not because of any religious dogma or affiliation and not because of their struggle against the Byzantine emperors to uphold a dogma, but for the simple reason that they were monks of the Monastery of Marun. Thus the association of the Maronites with the Mardaites is historically false. This association is a relatively recent theory of contemporary Maronite writers. It is possible, however, that some Mardaites, or for that matter some of the Jarajima, mingled with and finally became assimilated by the Maronites, but this is sheer speculation which cannot be supported by historical evidence. Such modern writers as Philip Hitti, who have made these conclusions, have no historical means of proving their findings.[59] Indeed, the opinion that the Mardaites and the Jarajima were the Maronites defies historical evidence. This is particularly true of Tal Mahri's account which indicates that the Maronites

were originally monks who became Monothelites in the seventh century and a distinct religious sect in the eighth century, not a group of warlike men. These Maronites lived at the beginning in Syria proper and not in Lebanon.[60]

20

The Maronites and Monothelitism

To the Maronites Monothelitism is a touchy question. The Maronites, particularly those who were educated in the Maronite school in Rome in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and who wrote mostly in Latin, denied that the Maronites or their church had ever been Monothelites. The names and writings of these and other later Maronites have been discussed earlier. More than any other Maronite, Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs vehemently defended the "orthodoxy" (Chalcedonian faith) of his church against what he considers the "sheer envy" of critics, Chalcedonians or otherwise. His book *Ruh al-Rudud,* a refutation of the opinion of Syrian Roman Catholic Bishop Yusuf Dawud, is but one example. From this and others of his books we can readily detect the reason behind the fury of the Maronites on the subject of Monothelitism, namely, the accusation of heresy. They unanimously counter their critics by attempting to prove that the Maronite Church has always been "orthodox," that is, holding the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon, and, therefore, never heretical.

We have previously shown that John Marun, the alleged first Maronite patriarch, was a Monothelite. Such a conclusion is not based exclusively on the account of Chalcedonian Patriarch Sa'id Ibn Batriq but is established by Maronite ritual books. Of all the writers who described John Marun as a Monothelite, Ibn Batriq is the one who is most hated and ridiculed by the Maronites. Almost every Maronite

writer has in one way or another tried to refute his account of John Marun. Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi devoted the entire second part of his *History of the Maronite Denomination* to the refutation of various critics, beginning with Ibn Batriq.[1] The number of ancient writers who described the Maronites as Monothelitic are many, and it would be tedious to discuss all of their accounts on the topic since their conclusions are the same.[2] In this chapter we will attempt to trace the Monothelitism of the Maronite Church, deriving information basically from Maronite books other than those attributed to John Marun, in addition to several testimonies of both Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic writers.

Among the books Maronites claim of genuine Maronite origin is *Kitab al-Huda (Book of Direction or Nomocanon).* This book contains the canons and rules which regulate the Maronite Church and the religious life of its members. Written originally in Syriac, *al-Huda* survives only in an Arabic translation (Garshuni) of the Syriac done in 1059 by a metropolitan named Dawud in answer to the request of a certain Yusuf, who may have been a monk or an abbot. The oldest copy of this manuscript is in the Vatican Library MS 133, transcribed in 1402.[3] The author of this book is not known, but there is a reference to him as the "Holy Father" by both the monk Yusuf and the Metropolitan Dawud. Who this "Holy Father" is, however, remains a mystery. In fact, the only information about the identity of the translator, the Metropolitan Dawud, is that his name is written in the Vatican manuscript. Once more we feel the dearth of genuine Maronite writing and the question arises as to whether the Maronites had writings independent from those of the Syrian Orthodox Church.

The writer of *Kitab al-Huda,* a Maronite, was a Monothelite who expressed Monothelitism in the most explicit theological terms. He wrote:

> We believe and proclaim that one of the Holy Trinity the Son Logos was begotten of the Father not in time or in the beginning and not like physical bodies generated from one another, but He is light of light, true God of true God, who for his abundant mercy has offered salvation for mankind by the will of the Holy Ghost, He descended from heaven but without departing from the selfsame Father without change or corruption. He was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the immaculate daughter of Yuaqim [Jehoiakim] and took from her a body like ours and with rational soul and became like us in everything save sin; and was born of her one Son and one Lord Jesus Christ, one person of two rational essences, one of the

> eternal Father in His divinity and one of our essence in His humanity, fallible in His humanity and infallible in His divinity, finite in His humanity and infinite in His divinity.
>
> Now if we hold this belief of Him, then, we do not anymore maintain that he is two persons, two Christs, two wills or two actions (operations). Never! We believe that He is one Jesus Christ, the Son of God who for us became man, one person with two rational essences, one will and one operation.[4]

After discussing briefly the authority of the first four ecumenical councils, the author describes the Christian denominations in his time and attributes the Maronite denomination to "John Marun, Patriarch of great Antioch." He further states that he has described in detail the condition and doctrinal position of the Malkites and the Maronites in his letter, which he calls the "Epistle of Justice," to the holy father Arsanius, bishop of Ayn Qura (al-Aquri). However, he provides no additional information about Bishop Arsanius or his bishopric. The name of this Bishop Arsanius of Ayn Qura is not mentioned in the Vatican MS 133, which suggests that it has been interpolated by later Maronite copyists. The author of *al-Huda* maintains that the Malkites and the Maronites are a single group which holds the same belief regarding the essence and the union of the two natures of Jesus Christ in one person, but that they differ regarding His will: the Malkites recognize two wills in Christ; the Maronites recognize one in Him.[5]

Immediately following this statement of faith, the author presents another testimony about Maronite Monothelitism and shows the differences between the Malkites and the Maronites concerning the one will in Christ. He proceeds to point out the disparity between them on the question of one or two wills in Christ. He asserts that the Malkites maintain that Christ has two wills—one of His divine essence and one of His human essence—while the Maronites hold that there is only one will. Then he presents the proofs of both groups in support of their standpoints.[6]

The testimonies in *al-Huda* prove that the Maronites were Monothelites, although some Maronite writers claim that the eleventh-century Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, distorted this book by interpolating the phrases on the one will in Christ. Istefan al-Duwayhi accused Tuma not only of interpolation but of composing the above-mentioned letter to Arsanius, bishop of Ayn Qura (Aqura) with its profession of the Monothelite doctrine. Al-Duwayhi presents no evidence to support this claim. He also fails to identify Bishop Arsanius to whom Tuma allegedly wrote the letter, or to ascertain if he was a contemporary of his bishop of

Kfartab.[7] Bishop Yusuf Deryan questions the basis on which al-Duwayhi accused Tuma of writing a letter to Arsanius. Deryan observes that the dates on Arsanius's life are not known and that he has never been mentioned in any source except in *al-Huda*. Furthermore, Deryan retorts that Tuma never mentioned Bishop Arsanius in his *Ten Treatises*, and that the language of the *Treatises* is less eloquent than that of the letter addressed to Arsanius.[8] On the other hand, Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud is of the opinion that al-Duwayhi's accusations of Tuma's having distorted this book is untenable, and that Arsanius, bishop of Ayn Qura, is perhaps a fictitious person.[9]

There is nothing in the extant copies of *Kitab al-Huda* to indicate that Tuma distorted it, and we cannot take al-Duwayhi's allegation of distortion seriously.[10] However, al-Duwayhi had second thoughts when he saw the copy of this book in the Vatican Library and wrote in its margin that he questioned whether the interpolations were made by Tuma of Kfartab or the translator, the Metropolitan Dawud. Al-Duwayhi then compounds his error by attributing the whole book of *al-Huda* to the famous eleventh-century Nestorian writer, Abu al-Faraj Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib (d. 1034). He must have reached this conclusion when he became convinced that his accusation of Tuma's distorting *al-Huda* was untenable. For this reason he deleted the entire sixth chapter from his *History of the Maronite Denomination* and wrote a new chapter attributing *al-Huda* to Ibn al-Tayyib.[11] The new chapter survives in the manuscript of al-Duwayhi's *History* in the Monastery of Our Lady of Louisa in Lebanon, but was included in another copy of this *History* published in 1890 by its editor Rashid al-Shartuni.

The main culprit, according to al-Duwayhi, is the Malkite Patriarch Sa'id Ibn Batriq who, by stating that John Marun was the generator of the doctrine of one will in Christ, "planted a trap on the road to history to catch those who walk through it without direction."[12] He states that among those who fell into this trap was Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib, a Maronite by origin. Al-Duwayhi continues that when Ibn al-Tayyib read the history of Ibn Batriq and learned that the Malkites differed from the Maronites over the unity of the wills of Christ, just as they differed from the Nestorians over the unity of the persons of Christ, he renounced the faith of his fathers. Not heeding the office of the priesthood he had received from the chief priests of the "Maronite nation," he fell into the trap planted by Ibn Batriq a hundred years earlier and gave support to the doctrine of one will (Monothelitism), antagonizing those who rejected it. For this reason he was banished from his country (al-Duwayhi does not identify the country, but he must have meant Leba-

non). During his exile he sent letters containing commentaries on the doctrine of two wills in Christ to the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon hoping to sway them to his opinion. He also wrote a book called *al-Huda* which among other things contains debates between the Malkites and the Maronites, particularly over the one or two wills in Christ.[13]

This episode recounted by al-Duwayhi is groundless. The priest Abu al-Faraj Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib was a Nestorian, not a Maronite, and a native of Iraq, not Lebanon. He was secretary to the Nestorian Catholicos (a rank second to patriarch) Yuhanna (John) Nazuk and died in 1034, the time of Yuhanna's successor, Iliyya (Elias).[14] Although Assemani states that Ibn al-Tayyib was a Nestorian, he seems to believe that Ibn al-Tayyib delivered a copy of *al-Huda* to a group of Maronites in Lebanon. He adds that when this Nestorian writer learned that a Maronite denomination maintained the Monothelite doctrine of the one will as the Nestorians did, he thought that the beliefs of the two groups on the Incarnation were the same and therefore sent them this book.[15] While Assemani's statement is sheer speculation, it is very important because it contains an admission by this learned Maronite that the Maronites were Monothelites. Such an admission contradicts the claim of al-Qila'i and al-Duwayhi that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, was the first Maronite to proclaim the doctrine of one will. Assemani's statement leaves no room for doubt that another writer, Ibn al-Tayyib, who preceded Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, by almost fifty years, recognized the Maronites as Monothelites.

How did Istefan al-Duwayhi arrive at the conclusion that Ibn al-Tayyib was a Maronite and that he wrote the book *al-Huda,* then sending it to the Maronites of Lebanon? Apparently, al Duwayhi was misled by a commentary on the Gospel by Ibn al-Tayyib, which was perhaps distorted by a Maronite writer to suit the Maronite doctrine of one will (Monothelitism). There is extant a large copy of this distorted commentary in the Vatican Syriac MS 405; it was the property of the Maronite school in Rome before it became the property of the Vatican Library. Al-Duwayhi must have read this copy and mistook its author, Ibn al-Tayyib, for a Maronite because of the many testimonies Ibn al-Tayyib allegedly provided to substantiate his Monothelitism.[16]

The distortion of the text of this manuscript is evident throughout the entire Vatican copy. In the introduction Ibn al-Tayyib states that though unworthy and destitute of knowledge (a kind of Oriental expression of humility) he finds himself motivated by necessity to collect the testimonies from the commentaries on the Book of Life (the Gospel) by such doctors of the church as the eminent interpretor "St. Theodore of

Mopsuestia" and John Chrysostom; he then wrote them in Arabic which prevailed in Iraq, his homeland, where the majority of the people no longer understood the Syriac language. This statement of Ibn al-Tayyib was most likely distorted in order to make it read as thought he added the names of Saint Cyril of Alexandria and Dionysius (whom Ibn al-Tayyib does not identify) to the names of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom and that he wrote it in Arabic because Arabic prevailed in this country and the Lebanese no longer understood the Syriac language. The intention of the person who made this distortion was perhaps to lead the reader into believing that the author was a Maronite who wrote this commentary on the Gospel in Lebanon.[17]

The doctrine of one will in Christ appears in many places in this commentary on the Gospel added by the Maronite distorter. On the prayer of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt" (Matthew 26:39 and Mark 14:36), Ibn al-Tayyib comments that this verse can be given different connotations. One of these connotations is that the will of Christ and that of the Father are not one, and he remarks that many have been misled by this interpretation. He then proposes what he believes to be the solution of this point: Our Lord's saying, "not as I will, but as Thou wilt," should be understood to mean not "I will" as a man but that "Your will and mine are one, because Christ at that time put Himself in place of all the creation and bore its sins."[18] He explains that the fact that the will of Christ and the will of the Father are one is demonstrated by Christ saying in other places, "I can of mine own self do nothing" and that "I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me" (John 5:30). In other words, what Ibn al-Tayyib was discussing in this context is that the wills of Christ and the Father are one, not whether Christ had one will or two wills. This is exactly what Ibn al-Tayyib meant, but the Maronite distorter added his own comment to read that "the gist of all this is one will and one voluntary operation in Christ."[19]

On the Lord's cleansing of the leper (Mark 1:40–42), Ibn al-Tayyib states that he would silence those who divide the works of our Lord by attributing some of them to His divine will and others to His human will. "See," he retorts, "how Our Lord told the leper, 'I will: be thou clean,' which indicates that His will is one and His voluntary operation is also one."[20] Furthermore, in his comment on Moses' lifting up the serpent in the wilderness (John 3:14), he states that "the divine person has been united with the human person and the divine will with the human nature."[21] In other places he refutes those who hold two wills in Christ,

which is an interpretation made by the Maronite distorter for it does not appear in the original.[22]

As we stated earlier, Ibn al-Tayyib was neither a Maronite nor the author of *al-Huda*; neither did he deliver this book to the inhabitants of Mount Lebanon. Ibn al-Tayyib mentions nothing about Lebanon or its inhabitants in the introduction to this commentary on the Gospel. Even if he did state that he wrote the commentary on the Gospel in Arabic for the benefit of the inhabitants of Lebanon because they could no longer understand the Syriac language, this statement in itself is sufficient proof that he was not the author of *al-Huda,* which was originally written in Syriac, not Arabic, and translated into the latter language by a certain Metropolitan Dawud. Maronite Bishop Yusuf Deryan expresses surprise at al-Duwayhi's claim that Ibn al-Tayyib wrote this book and sent it to the people of Lebanon to deceive them into accepting Monothelitism.[23]

In a discussion in his book *Ruh al-Rudud,* Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs strives to absolve the author of *al-Huda* and consequently the Maronites from having been Monothelites, but most of his arguments are iterations of al-Duwayhi's position, which is untenable.[24] However, al-Dibs makes the startling statement that the Metropolitan Dawud related in his book that it is possible to proclaim one will in Christ in the same "Catholic" sense used by Pope Honorius.[25] To substantiate this point of view, al-Dibs quotes the following statement from *al-Huda* (Vatican Syriac MS 133): "These two wills of Christ are either united or separate. If they are united in every aspect, it follows that they become one on account of their union and objective. And if they are separate, it follows that the divine essence wills what the human essence wills not and vice versa [with the result that their union becomes null]."[26] This is indeed an important passage, particularly when it is cited by a writer such as al-Dibs. Though he is mistaken in attributing authorship of the book to Metropolitan Dawud, this passage contains for the first time al-Dibs's admission that the Maronites were Monothelites but in a "Catholic sense." It also shows that the Maronite theology discussed by the author of *al-Huda* was unequivocally Monothelite. Furthermore, it destroys al-Dibs's claim (as well as that of al-Qilaʿi and al-Duwayhi) that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, had distorted *al-Huda* by deliberately inserting passages on Monothelitism. Maronite Bishop Yusuf Deryan, even more than al-Dibs, elaborates on the premise of accepting Monothelitism in a "Catholic" sense.[27] However, al-Dibs and Deryan are not the first Maronites in modern times to explain Monothelitism in a "Catholic sense." It was attempted in the seventeenth century by Faustus Nairon, whose opinion both al-Dibs and Deryan cite as evidence. In his disserta-

tion on the origin of the Maronites, Faustus Nairon explains Monothelitism in the light of the quotation previously cited from *al-Huda*. He writes that in some instances when Maronites professed one will in Christ they actually meant that the two wills of Christ were in complete and perfect agreement with each other, not with respect to Christ's powers which they maintain to be two—that is the divine and the human power.[28] He cites *al-Huda,* as written by Metropolitan Dawud, as being one case, though more correctly, Dawud is translator, not author. Nairon quotes a source (which he does not properly identify) which in turn refers to the Gospel to prove the "Catholic sense" of Monothelitism. The Biblical reference is to Mark 7:24, "And from thence he arose, and went into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and entered into a house, and would have no man know it: but He could not be hid." To the question of whether Christ could or could not do everything—in this case, hiding from the crowd—the answer is that in His humanity Christ wanted to be hid but could not. However, in His divinity He was able to do anything. Because Christ willed not, but still acted and willed, but could not act, He, then, of necessity should have two perfect united wills without separation or contradiction, although His human nature is subject to His divine nature. Thus he who professes one will in Christ is blaspheming. On the other hand, to him who understands, as the Maronites do, that the one will of Christ is the outcome of the unity and the agreement of His two wills, the whole matter is relegated to the concept that as when two or more men agree on one given object, their wills become one regarding that object. Such an analogy does not mean that one of the wills becomes void. What is understood by the one will here is that the purpose and objective of both wills are one; at the same time the divine nature and the human nature possess their own respective wills without separation. Nairon adds that one may deduce from this testimony that those who profess one will in Christ are not attempting to establish that there is but one individual will in Christ, but that His two wills do not act in disagreement with or in contradiction to each other: in other words, the human will of Christ is completely subject to and fulfills the orders of His divine will. This explanation of the one will, Nairon states, is purely "Catholic" and in conformity with the testimony the Sixth Council adopted in its seventeenth session.[29]

From this account we are led to believe that the Maronites were Monothelites but in a "Catholic" context. However, while al-Dibs appeals to *al-Huda* and Pope Honorius to prove his point of view, Deryan appeals to Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, to demonstrate that the Monothelitism of the Maronites is in conformity with the Monothe-

litism as Pope Honorius understood it. It should be remembered that Maronite writers accuse Tuma of distorting their books by inserting Monothelite testimonies. Deryan seems to accept Tuma's interpretation of Monothelitism in what Deryan believes to be in conformity with the "Catholic" faith. After reproducing several quotations from Tuma's *Ten Treatises,* Deryan avows his own conclusions.[30] He emphasizes that the teaching of the bishop of Kfartab is the same as that of the Maronites. The Maronites possess no other source which demonstrates this teaching. Deryan believes that the faith expressed by the bishop of Kfartab in no way contradicts the spirit of the teaching of the "Catholic Church" (the Roman Catholic Church) regarding this doctrinal matter. He asserts that the Monothelite doctrine maintained by the Maronites does not, either in essence or in consequence, conform with the "true" meaning of the traditional Monothelitism of the seventh century. For this reason Deryan asserts that although the Maronites have strictly upheld Monothelitism as interpreted by Tuma, it is not permissible to call them Monothelites because the term applies only to a group of Christians known for their erroneous teachings and for principles which contradict the faith of the "Catholic" Church (the Church of Rome). He explains that this group of Christians appeared in the first quarter of the seventh century and were condemned by the Sixth Council, after which they gradually disappeared. No trace of them can be found today in the Chalcedonian churches.[31] To substantiate his conclusions, Deryan cites nineteenth-century Cardinal Franzelin. Writing on the Incarnation, Franzelin affirms that Pope Honorius understood Monothelitism in a "Catholic sense." He explains that those who deny the existence of two wills in Christ—one, the divine will, acting in a celestial manner, while the other, the human will, acting in a terrestrial manner—or who deny the human will in Him insofar as it opposes His divine will would make the two wills one in agreement and action. Such teaching, Franzelin asserts, could possibly be called "Catholic," that is, in conformity with the teaching of the Church of Rome. Franzelin continues that Pope Honorius understood this matter as Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, had explained to him in a letter about the heated controversy between Cyrus of Alexandria and Sophronius, bishop of Jerusalem, concerning whether the Lord Christ has one will and one operation or two wills and two operations. Franzelin states that what confirms his opinion that Honorius understood Monothelitism in this sense is contained in a letter from Honorius to Sergius:

> Accordingly we affirm one will of our Lord Jesus Christ. [*unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi*] since our

> [human] nature was plainly assumed by the godhead, and this being faultless, as it was before the fall. For Christ, coming in the form of sinful flesh, took away the sin of the world, and assuming the form of a servant, He is *habitu inventus est ut homo*. As He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, so was He also born without sin of the holy and immaculate virgin, the God bearer without experiencing contamination of the *vitiata natura*.[32]

Deryan points out the similarity between this passage and the Monothelitism of the Maronites as explained by Tuma, bishop of Kfartab; in fact, he asserts that the similarity is so close that it is highly possible that the bishop of Kfartab derived it from Honorius's letter to Sergius. Deryan sees this as no contradiction to the fact that Pope Honorius was considered a heretic by the Sixth Council. He contends that Honorius was not condemned because of the error in his teachings, but because he tolerated the Monothelite leaders and wrote to them without sufficiently investigating their error, thus giving them the opportunity to use his letter to deceive the faithful without his being aware of their intentions.[33]

The use of Honorius's letter to substantiate the view that Monothelitism can be interpreted in a "Catholic" sense is untenable. Monothelitism explicitly means "one will," regardless of the different interpretations of the mode of the union of the two wills in Christ. The old Antiochians and even Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch (260–272), were Monothelites. They maintained that Jesus Christ had one will (mia thelesis) or as Paul of Samosata states, "the different persons have one single mode of union—agreement in will, from which it appears that there is a unity as to energy in the things thus joined together."[34] In fact, the *Ecthesis* published by Emperor Heraclius expressly admits that Nestorius never taught the doctrine of two wills.[35] Another source which indicates that the Nestorians were Monothelites is the letter from Nestorian Patriarch Timothy in 791 to the Monks of the Monastery of Marun.[36] Indeed, Assemani himself recognizes that the Nestorians were Monothelites.[37] According to Harnack, "the different natures and the different persons have one single mode of union—agreement of will, from which it plainly appears that there is a unity to the energy in the things thus joined together," is the basis of the Antiochean dogmatic view after it had developed into the doctrine of two natures.[38] We have shown earlier that Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, collected many passages from Dionysius, the Areopagite, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, and others which prove that they taught the doctrine of one energy in Christ.[39] The entire matter is related to the controversy over the mode of

union of the two natures of Christ and whether such a union implies as well the union of the two wills in the same Christ. Such controversy was perhaps one of the most fundamental aspects of the Christologies of the ancient schools of Antioch and Alexandria. Both these schools had their own views of the union of the two natures and wills of Christ.[40] The Antiochians reason that as long as the human nature of Christ is in the service of the divine, it is totally filled with the divine will. Thus, according to Harnack, the Antiochian term (mia thelēsis) was not the "product of a physico-psychological, but an ethical, mode of regarding Christ."[41] On the other hand, the Alexandrians considered the God-Logos (Word) as the subject of the God-Man who made the human nature his own and thus envisaging a unity of energy with its basis in the ineffable constitution of the God-Man.[42] Thus the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* of Saint Cyril necessitates also one will of the same God-Logos (Word).

The two opinions are essentially in agreement that the outcome of the unity of the wills of Christ is one will; they differ only over the mode of the union of the two wills of Christ. It is, therefore, unessential and even futile to claim that there are two kinds of Monothelitisms, one "Catholic" and the other "heretical." Honorius may well have believed that his understanding of Monothelitism was in agreement with the Monothelite terminology used by Sergius and Theodore of Pharan on the grounds that the sinless human will of Christ could not be in conflict with His divine will because these two wills acting in unison could no longer be distinguished from one another.[43] It is also possible that Honorius understood Monothelitism in light of the Chalcedonian formula of faith referred to by al-Dibs and Deryan as the "Catholic" sense. This is also what the Right Reverend Charles J. Hefele attempted to do with the Monothelitic phrase of Pope Honorius: *Unde et unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi* (Accordingly, we affirm one will of Our Lord Jesus Christ). Hefele describes this as "the unhappy sentence," and admits that it is "quite Monothelitic if taken literally."[44] Whether or not Hefele succeeded in his interpretation of what he wished to be the "Catholic" connotation of Honorius's Monothelitic statement, the unsavory fact remains that the members of the Sixth Council condemned Honorius as well as Monothelitism. Here is their verdict:

> In addition, we anathematize and reject the authors and makers of unnecessary and new dogmas. We speak of Theodore who was the bishop of Pharan, of Sergius who used to be the bishop of this our queen city [Constantinople]. We also anathematize Honorius, who

> used to be the Pope of old Rome, as a maker, and as one who concurred with and confirmed this heresy [Monothelitism].[45]

In his edict endorsing the acts of this council and posted in the court of the great church in the neighborhood of Dicymbalon, the Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, confirmed the anathema of the heresy of Theodore of Pharan, Sergius of Constantinople, and Pope Honorius of old Rome.[46]

But no one precisely delineated the "heresy" of Honorius as well as Pope Leo II, in his letter to Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus confirming the decisions of the Sixth Council. He wrote:

> Likewise, we anathematize the inventors of new heresy, that is to say, Theodore, bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrus, Paul and Peter all of whom were legitimate patriarchs of the Church of Constantinople. We also anathematize Honorius who did not give glory to this apostolic church by a doctrine of apostolic tradition but rather tried to subvert the immaculate faith by a profane treason and those who died in his error and we hold in abomination their imitation and accomplices who were with him, or who are now with them, namely Macarius, a most deceiver of the Church of Antioch.[47]

Hefele took upon himself the painful task of attempting to exonerate Pope Honorius from heresy or at least to establish the point that the pope was misunderstood. The fact remains, however, that in the judgment of the Sixth Council this pope was declared a heretic.[48]

In the light of the decision of the Sixth Council, the possibility of maintaining Monothelitism in the "Catholic" sense as al-Dibs, Deryan, and others have wished is no longer tenable. This council was accepted by all Chalcedonian churches, particularly the Church of Rome and the Uniate Churches of the East (including the Maronite Church) and it unanimously condemned Monothelitism as a heresy. Any interpretation of this doctrine by Chalcedonians is a purely academic matter. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Maronite Church accepted the Sixth Council until at least the sixteenth century. Certainly, John Marun, believed to be the first Maronite patriarch, never mentioned the council in his writings; he only refers to the first four ecumenical councils.[49] Furthermore, Maronite ritual books until the late sixteenth century contained the doctrine of Monothelitism, at which time they were "purged" by missionaries from the Roman Church to restore the Maronites to its fold. Be that as it may, modern Maronites, who maintained that their ancestors have

never been at any time Monothelites, now conceded that their ancestors were Monothelites but in a "Catholic sense."[50]

The Monothelitism of the Maronites is affirmed by their ritual books. The propitiatory prayer (Husoyo in Syriac), which the officiating priest recites at the beginning of the celebration of the Mass, contains the following Monothelitic passages: "Praise be to the Merciful one who dwelt in Mary in lowliness and shone forth from her womb as a man in humility. He went out to the wilderness with an ineffable union of His two true natures. He is one person and one will maintaining the properties of the dual natures without division."[51]

The profession of the one will of Christ is obvious in this prayer, but some Maronites attempt to explain it in what they believe is a "Catholic" rationale. Commenting on this passage, Maronite Rev. Paul Abraham remarks that what the Maronites meant by one will in this context is the moral unity of the two wills because "in Christ there was no will to sin." He concludes that this is what Pope Honorius meant by one will in his letter to Sergius.[52] This apology is rather lame. The prayer cited above is expressly Monothelitic and was used by many Maronite priests whenever they celebrated the Holy Eucharist to confirm their faith that Christ had but one will. It contradicts the sense of the Sixth Council which affirmed two wills and two natural operations which is to be understood then that two wills and operations exist without separation, without change, without partition, and without confusion.[53] Since then it has remained the definitive formula accepted by the Church of Rome in 680 and any rationale in support of the one will is contrary to it and without doctrinal or canonical justification.

Another Maronite ritual book which professes the doctrine of one will in Christ is the order of the ordination of deacons, priests and bishops. The bishop reads to a priest at his ordination the following statement containing a confession of the one will in Christ:

> Be united in the true faith with Jesus Christ who has made you worthy to serve in this office. It is the faith of our saints and fathers the Apostles as well as the faith affirmed by the Councils, and the canons which contain their true teaching that our Lord and God Jesus Christ is one person, one Son, one Christ, and one will. For this reason He said, "I have come not to do my will but the will of Him who sent me." God forbid that He has two wills, and that after their union the Trinity be called a Quaternity.[54]

These and other testimonies provide sufficient proof that the faith of the Maronite Church was not in conformity with the faith of the Church of

Rome, especially after the Sixth Council condemned Monothelitism.

The Monothelitism of the Maronites was also recognized by a host of non-Maronite writers, particularly theologians and church historians from different denominations. Perhaps the earliest account on this subject is the one by Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (715–729 or 733). He states that, like many other heretics, the Maronites rejected the Fifth and Sixth councils but accepted the Fourth Council of Chalcedon. He refers to their disputations on this point with the "Jacobites," who considered the Maronites as lacking in reason because of their acceptance of the Fourth Council while rejecting the Fifth and Sixth councils. After relating that the Maronites had a monastery in Syria, he makes the observation that the majority of the Maronites, (meaning the monks of the Monastery of Marun) not only categorically rejected the Fifth and Sixth councils but also the Fourth Council of Chalcedon. He does not explain this rejection but concludes that it is a matter of common sense that those who accept the Fourth Council should necessarily accept the Sixth Council since it approves the transactions of the Fourth.[55] This testimony is of great importance since it comes from the head of the Church of Constantinople which had accepted the Council of Chalcedon. Unfortunately, Germanos offers no information about the reasons or the circumstances under which the Maronites rejected the Council of Chalcedon. The only conclusion we are able to reach in the light of this testimony is that many Maronite monks who were coerced by Emperor Heraclius into accepting the Council of Chalcedon renounced it when his death freed them from fear of persecution. This testimony fits in perfectly with the writings of the Syrian patriarch of Antioch, Dionysius Tal Mahri, on Heraclius and the Maronite monks which led to the conclusion that these monks were not Chalcedonian but Syrian Orthodox—Monophysites prior to the first half of the seventh century. Germanos would not have stated that a great number of Maronites renounced the Fourth Council of Chalcedon unless he had knowledge of their doing so in his own time.

Further testimony on the subject which carries a great deal of weight comes from John of Damascus (d. 756), perhaps the most famous Chalcedonian theologian and a celebrated Saint of the Malkite Church. Saint John of Damascus was a native of Syria and quite familiar with the different church denominations in his time; his familiarity with the faith of the Maronites is, therefore, indisputable. In his voluminous writings John of Damascus twice mentions the Maronites in connection with their faith. In his *De Recta Sententia* he labels them as Monothelites. After swearing by the Holy Trinity that he holds the right faith, he

goes on to say that, "I will never accept any faith contrary to what I have stated or associate with a person who does not profess this faith, most especially the Maronites."[56] John of Damascus's reference to the Maronites was in connection with the Trisagion, particularly the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us, have mercy on us,* which he and other writers erroneously ascribe to Peter Fuller, patriarch of Antioch. It is important here to explain the position of John of Damascus on this added passage in the Trisagion. While some Chalcedonian fathers of the church, particularly Patriarch Ephraim of Amida, state that they could accept this addition to the Trisagion if it were intended for the second person of the Trinity—Christ—John of Damascus categorically rejected it. To him, those who use the Trisagion with the addition *Thou who wast crucified for us* ascribe the crucifixion to the whole Trinity. Since the Maronites were among those who used the addition, John of Damascus considered them heterodox.[57] He makes his point on the Trisagion more decisive by a letter addressed to Archimandrite Jordanus (Epistola ad Jordanem Archimandritam). He states that Peter the Fuller did not fear to bleach the hymn of the Trisagion like a dirty garment; if this holy hymn is chanted about the Son alone, every doubt would be removed and "we become Maronitized [act like the Maronites] by ascribing the crucifixion to the whole Trinity. Heaven forbid that we repeat this [Trisagion] with our lips. May God be merciful to us and spare us from this death, for death is in this cup."[58]

It may be observed that John of Damascus coined the phrase "to Maronitize" when referring to the Maronites' ascription of the crucifixion to the whole Trinity. Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs was unhappy with this statement and attempted to demonstrate that there is nothing in the latter's writings that branded the Maronites as heretics. He contends that John of Damascus did not coin the phrase "to Maronitize" but rather used the word "Baronizmen" (to rave like drunks) to describe those who address the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* to the second person of the Trinity—Christ. Al-Dibs also maintains that the Maronites in the time of John of Damascus were called "Mardaites or Marada," not Maronites, and that Michel Lequien, who edited the *De Recta Sententia,* was deceived by John of Damascus's phrase "most especially the Maronites." This phrase is incorrect and does not appear in the original manuscript of *De Recta.* Finally, al-Dibs asserts that the Trisagion with the interpolated phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* could be used in a "Catholic" sense. He also claims that in his writings Lequien vindicated the Maronites from any "heresy."[59]

Al-Dibs's criticism of John of Damascus is unconvincing. It is true

that John of Damascus never directly referred to the Maronites as heretics, but as a Chalcedonian theologian who considered the interpolation to the Trisagion a heresy, he implies that the Maronites, who chanted the Trisagion with this interpolation, were heretics. The point is that no Chalcedonian church and this includes the Church of Rome ever chanted the Trisagion with this interpolation. In fact, in its eighty-first canon, the Quinisext of Trullan Council assembled in 692 forbade the addition of the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* to the Trisagion.[60] This is supported by Assemani, who elaborates on the acts of this council.[61] The justification, then, of the Trisagion, including the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us,* in a "Catholic" sense is tenuous. It is either orthodox or heterodox. While the Chalcedonian churches, except for the Maronites, labeled it as heresy, such anti-Chalcedonian churches as the Syrian, the Coptic, Ethiopian, and Armenian churches considered it an essential part of their orthodox faith. Al-Dibs is not justified in accusing Michel Lequien for the alleged interpolation of the words, "most especially the Maronites," into Saint John of Damascus's *De Recta Sententia* on the premise that these words were not included in the original text of the *De Recta Sententia.* Michel Lequien always defended the "Catholicity" of the Maronites and in many respects followed the opinions of Maronite writers;[62] however, in the case of the Trisagion he reported what he thought to be the truth about the Maronites.[63] There is no evidence that he distorted the text of John of Damascus. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe that Lequien is violating historical truth when he relates that the Maronites were Monothelites. His objectivity on this point is demonstrated by the fact that in his edition of the writings of John of Damascus he never neglects to quote the opinions of Maronite writers, particularly those of Faustus Nairon, testifying to the Monothelitism of the Maronites. Lequien also explains the origin of the Maronites who were Monophysites before they became Monothelites: "The inhabitants of Lebanon were the descendants of those Phoenician Monothelites, who not only previously had been recalcitrant at the Council of Chalcedon but also embraced the interpolation to the Trisagion coined by Peter the Fuller, but at least as Monothelites they broke with the Monophysites."[64]

Lequien not only makes it clear that the Maronites were Monothelites but suggests their reason for becoming Monothelites with regards to their attitude toward the Council of Chalcedon. In this context he is referring to the monks of the Monastery of Marun who were the forerunners of the later Maronite community. From this statement we may deduce that Lequien is referring to the period from the time of the Coun-

cil of Chalcedon in 451 to the first half of the seventh century when the first Maronites—the monks of the Monastery of Marun—became Monothelites by imposition of Emperor Heraclius. The statement is clear and positive on the point that these Maronite monks had been Monophysites, and though the heated controversy over the mode of the union of the two natures of Christ was finally thought to have been resolved by the Council of Chalcedon, the monks of the Monastery of Marun were recalcitrant in accepting the council's transactions. This recalcitrance must have resulted in anger and defiance on the part of these Monophysite monks who, like the majority of the church in Syria renounced the Council of Chalcedon and its definition of the faith. As Monophysites, the monks chanted the Trisagion hymn with the phrase, *Thou who wast crucified for us* appended to it, erroneously believed, by Lequien to have been interpolated by Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch in the last part of the fifth century. They remained Monophysites, holding Saint Cyril's formula of the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* until the beginning of the seventh century, when they became Monothelites under the Chalcedonian formula of faith imposed on them by emperor Heraclius. Though appearing to accept this faith because they were under coercion, they remained faithful to their original Monophysitic faith, which they kept intact in their ritual books. Their new creed of Monothelitism (one will in Christ) did not separate them drastically from the bulk of the orthodox Monophysites in Syria; the point of separation was their apparent acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon under imposition of imperial power. It is through this acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon and of Monothelitism as a doctrine that they became a distinct religious group in the middle of the eighth century.

What makes the testimony of Lequien even more important is the fact that he sympathizes with the Maronites. He is one of the first Western Roman Catholic writers in modern times to defend the "Catholicity" of the definition of the faith of Chalcedon as the final word of "orthodoxy." Yet he admits that the Maronites were Monophysites and defied the Council of Chalcedon. Such an admission does not support the position the Maronites have maintained since the sixteenth century, namely, that the Maronites were staunch defenders of the Council of Chalcedon and its formula of faith from the fifth century on. It also contradicts the allegation that Monophysite Patriarch of Antioch Severus and his Bishop Peter of Apamea ambushed and massacred three hundred and fifty monks. Indeed, if the Maronite monks were die-hard Chalcedonians who lost three hundred and fifty of their number for their Chalcedonian

faith and debated matters of the Christian doctrine with Monophysites at the end of the sixth century in Antioch, it would be futile for Lequien and other Roman Catholic writers, such as Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, to consider them as Monophysites or "Jacobites." We shall have recourse to the views of Lequien and Dawud later.

While Saint John of Damascus makes only a passing reference to the Monothelitism of the Maronites, other church dignitaries close to his time (such as, Nestorian Patriarchs Sliba Zkha (d. 728) and Timothy (d. 823), have positively affirmed the Maronite Monothelitism. In the eighth century the Nestorian catholicoi, who by then called themselves patriarchs, moved their See to Baghdad (built in 762), the capital of the Abbasid State and center of the political power of the caliphs. Nestorian physicians and patriarchs were highly favored at the court of the caliphs; this was particularly true of Timothy, whom the Caliph Harun al-Rashid addressed as "Abu al-Nasara" (Father of the Christians).[66] The Maronites, still a small group at the time, must have learned about the Nestorians in Iraq and the prestige their patriarchs enjoyed at the Abbasid court. They perhaps thought that placing themselves under the Nestorian patriarch, who was supported by the Abbasid state, would provide them protection from the persecution of the Malkites, who were trying to force them to join their church. They must have also learned that, like them, the Nestorians were Monothelites professing one will in Christ.[67] This must have prompted the Maronite Church leaders to write a letter to Sliba Zkha to explain their faith and express their desire to join his church. Lamentably, the letters exchanged between the Maronites and Sliba Zkha are lost. There is only a reference to them in a letter on the same subject from Patriarch Timothy to the Maronites, which fortunately survives in full. Abdisho Subawi, who mentions the many synodical and other letters written by Timothy, says nothing about it since no copy was available during his time in the Vatican Library or in Europe. We are informed by Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud that he acquired a collection of Syriac and Arabic manuscripts from the East in 1869 and took them with him to Rome to be deposited at the Library of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide (Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith).[68] Among these manuscripts was one containing Timothy's letter to the Maronites. This letter is addressed to the monks of Saint Marun, and he informs us that it was written in the thirteenth year of his patriarchate, that is, in 791. The letter is a very important source on the Monothelitism and other matters of the faith of the Maronites.

Timothy opens his letter with a greeting which recalls that of Saint Paul. He calls his addressees "the members of Our Lord Christ, the pious

and ascetic brothers who live under the canopy of St. Marun,—Timothy, the humble servant of the great God and Our Saviour Jesus Christ, who by the grace of God serves the patriarchal see in the city of the King (meaning Baghdad city of the caliph) sends greetings."[69] He then addresses himself to the points of the Maronites raised in their letter to him. He commends their faith, expressing joy at their recourse to him for union with his church, and alludes to their former communication with his predecessor Sliba Zkha. He goes on to explain to them the faith of the Nestorian Church in order that they may determine whether it is in conformity with their own faith. He elaborates on the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the two natures of Christ, stating that the recognition of two separate natures in Christ necessitates the recognition of two persons or two Christs—the one begotten of the Father, the other born of Mary. For this reason he elaborated on the term *Theotokos* (Mother of God) and contended that Mary should not be called the bearer or the Mother of God.[70] This was, of course, the doctrine held by Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, for which he was condemned by the Council of Ephesus (431). The main point is Timothy's statement of the belief of his church in one will in Christ: "The outcome of the unity of the two persons of Christ is one will, one power, one energy and one property. We do not then divide the Son of God into two wills, energies or properties as some wicked people do. Nay, anyone who does that should be cast into the palaces of the heretics, be clothed with the purple and become derelict."[71]

By the "palaces of the heretics" Timothy meant the palaces of the Byzantine emperors, particularly Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, in whose time the Sixth Council (680) condemned the doctrine of one will and instituted the doctrine of two wills and two energies in Christ.

Moving next to the Trisagion, Timothy admonishes the Maronite monks that this hymn could not, and should not, be chanted with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us,* even if it were addressed to the Son of God. He appeals to them to drop "this blasphemous phrase"[72] from use in their monastery; however, he seems to be willing to approve its use if its phraseology were changed into the following form: "Holy thou art God, Holy thou art Mighty, who for us became Incarnate and was crucified, Holy thou art Immortal have mercy upon us." Timothy rationalizes that only in this form could the phrase, *Thou who wast crucified for us,* have a place in the Trisagion. After affirming that his church had kept the faith without corruption since Apostolic times, he assures the Maronite monks that "there is nothing, our beloved brethren, that could prevent us from becoming one church in Christ Our Lord."[73]

He continues to coax the Maronite monks to join his church, explaining that many people (including thirteen churches in Najran in Arabia) had already done so, and that through his effort, the Turks and their Khaqan had been converted to Christianity and were under his ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[74] He closes his letter by stating the conditions for their joining his church. Among the doctrinal matters which he expects the members of the Monastery of Marun to profess before acceptance into his fold are the following: they must confess two natures and two persons in Christ; Our Lady the Virgin was to be called the Mother of Christ, not the Mother of God; and the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* must be dropped from the Trisagion. Finally, Timothy expected the Maronite monks to accept the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Diodorus, Nestorius, and to renounce Cyril the "heretic."[75]

The Monothelitism of the Maronite monks is implicit rather than explicit in this letter of Timothy. This is noticeable in his discussion of the doctrine of the two natures and two wills in Christ in his branding as heretics those who hold this doctrine. If the monks were holders of this doctrine, Timothy, as a matter of propriety, would not have branded people desiring to join his own church as heretics. As a learned man of the church, Timothy knew before hand that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Monothelites just as he was, and for this reason he did not invite them to profess one will in Christ before they qualified to join his fold. Thus this doctrine was not listed as one of the conditions for their union with his church. The crucial point, however, is that if, as contemporary Maronites claim, these monks were defenders of the faith of the Council of Chalcedon and sacrificed many lives on its behalf, why would they consider seeking unity with the Nestorian church whose doctrine had been condemned by the Council of Ephesus in 431 and with Nestorius after whom the church was named (condemned at the Council of Chalcedon by none other than his bosom friend Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, whose theological views were no different from those of Nestorius)? It is difficult to accept the objection of Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs that Timothy meant only the monks of the Monastery of Marun and not all Maronites, and that he did not invite the monks to profess one will in Christ because the Nestorians did not place emphasis on the one will or two wills in Christ but only on the two natures and the two persons in Christ.[76] It is strange and illogical that al-Dibs, who asserted that the monks who followed the ascetic Marun were defenders of the "Catholic" faith and that the people who accepted their teachings were called Maronites, separates the monks from the rest of the Maronites in his objection to Timothy's letter.[77] As to the second objection, it may be

true that the Nestorians placed no great emphasis on the doctrine of one will, but it was an essential part of their faith. This is evidenced in a letter Timothy wrote to a certain priest, Sergius, in which he defended and discussed in detail the doctrine of one will and one energy in Christ.[78]

The Reverend F. Nau is of the opinion that Timothy's letter was not addressed to the Maronite monks in Syria but to a tribe with a similar name who lived in Persia. Nau bases his theory on the term *Maronia,* which Assemani discussed in the third volume of his *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. Assemani states that *Maronia* was the name of a tribe holding the Nestorian faith, its members lived in the city of Maru (Merv) in the province of Khurasan in Persia. He does not identify the term *Maronia* with his own people, the Maronites in Syria and Lebanon. The Reverend Nau, who strives to defend the position of the Maronites and their having had perpetual association with the Church of Rome, finds in this term a case to destroy the authenticity of the communication between Timothy and the Maronites. He elaborates on *Maronia* showing that it is very similar in form to the Syriac *Maronia* (Maronites), and concludes that the great similarity between the two terms led some to believe that Patriarch Timothy had addressed the letter under discussion to the Maronites of Lebanon, while in fact he had addressed it to a Nestorian tribe of similar name which lived in Persia. Nau continues that there was a city mentioned by Strabo near the Persian Gulf named "Maron" whose inhabitants were semi-nomadic. Assemani marks their habitation as being in Maru. Nau claims that the letter of Timothy was addressed to monks from this tribe. to prove his point Nau points out that in the order in which Timothy's letters are arranged, this particular letter is situated between Timothy's letter to the monk Sergius in Ilam, southwest of Persia, and his letter to the monks of St. Gabriel near Mosul in Mesopotamia (Iraq). Nau continues that this patriarch wrote no less than fifty-nine letters, and that none of them was addressed to the monks in Syria, as he had no connection with them. Moreover, Timothy's letter is addressed "To the monks living under the canopy of Marun," and Nau argues that there is nothing in this address to indicate that it was sent to the monks of the Monastery of Marun. Even the term "canopy" in this context, according to Nau, does not denote to monastery, let alone the Monastery of Marun. He arrives at the conclusion that these monks were the aforementioned, living in tents in Persia and the followers of a man named Marun; possibly they lived in the city of Maron near the Persian Gulf or in a place called Maru in Mesopotamia.[79]

Nau's theory and argument are historically untenable. Nau overlooks the fact that this Persian tribe with a name similar to that of the Maronites was (and both he and Assemani before him admit this) of the Nestorian faith. They were already communicants with and under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Patriarch Timothy. Consequently, there was no need for Timothy to write a letter inviting them to join his church. It would have been futile for Timothy to explain to the Persian monks the tenets of his church's faith when they must have had a fair knowledge of it already. Indeed, the language and context of Timothy's letter indicate with utmost clarity that he was addressing monks who were not associated with his church and whom he wished to join his fold. In the same letter Timothy refers to the letter the monks of Marun had delivered to his predecessor, Sliba Zkha, and expresses his joy at their desire to unite with his church. If we follow Nau's argument to its logical end we find ourselves forced to accept that Sliba Zkha addressed the monks in Persia and not in Syria. Nau also understands the word "canopy" in Timothy's letter literally; Timothy certainly did not mean by "canopy" a tent or a monastery but "the spiritual canopy of the faith of Marun." Rather, he meant that these monks were living in a community of brotherhood at the Monastery of Marun. Finally, by basing his whole argument on the nuance of similar terms, Nau renders his thesis all the more untenable.

In conclusion, the Monothelitism of the Maronites is predicated on both internal and external evidence. Several testimonies remain on the Monothelitism of the Maronites which have great bearing on the relation of the Maronites with the Church of Rome; these will be discussed in the next chapter.

21

The Relation of the Maronites to the Church of Rome

MARONITE and some Roman Catholic writers maintain that the Maronite Church has been in communion with the Church of Rome since ancient times. A contemporary writer, Rev. G. C. Anawati states that "the Maronite Church has remained united with Rome since its foundation in the fifth and sixth centuries."[1] Such a statement is historically groundless, for in those two centuries the Maronite Church did not yet exist, nor was there an ecclesiastical relation between the Maronites as a religious group, or even between the monks of the Monastery of Marun in Syria Secunda and the Church of Rome. The alleged letter which the monks of Syria Secunda, including some monks from the Monastery of Marun, addressed to Pope Hormisda is, as has been shown earlier, highly vulnerable and in the opinion of this writer, spurious. Historical fact indicates that it was not until the Crusades in the eleventh century that the Maronites first came in contact with the dignitaries of the Church of Rome in the East.

The first to mention this contact is William, bishop of Tyre. William, probably of Frankish or Germanic origin, was born in Jerusalem and studied in Europe. In the year 1167, when he was ordained an archdeacon of the Latin Church in Tyre, the greater part of Syria and Palestine was in the hands of the Crusaders. In 1174 Aimery or Aimerick, the Latin patriarch of Antioch, ordained William a bishop of the Latin Church of Tyre with the approval of Baldwin, the Frankish

king. William lived for a while in Antioch and was thoroughly familiar with conditions in Syria under the Crusaders. The history he wrote about the Crusaders in Syria in the twelfth century is perhaps the only historical record of that period written in Latin. It has been used by many later writers, especially those who wrote in Latin.

In a lengthy testimony William of Tyre refers to the Maronites in two contexts. He describes them as being part of the Syrian nation and as having been Monothelites for five hundred years, stating that through divine providence they renounced this heresy by professing the true faith in the presence of Aimery and by showing readiness to accept the teaching of the Church of Rome. William of Tyre states further that these Maronites were about forty thousand in number. They were a strong people and rendered great service to "us concerning our many and significant interests with our enemies. For this reason, our people (the Latin Crusaders) were overwhelmed with joy when these Maronites returned to the true faith,"[2] meaning the faith of the Church of Rome.

William of Tyre has been criticized by such Maronite writers as al-Duwayhi and also by some Western writers for ascribing Monothelitism to the Maronites. These writers maintain that in ascribing the Monothelite heresy to John Marun or to the Maronites, William of Tyre copied the anachronistic and erroneous account of Saʿid Ibn Batriq.[3] Robert W. Crawford, who proposes to show that William of Tyre was wrong in attributing Monothelitism to the Maronites or their founder, begins with the erroneous premise that William of Tyre is the main source of later Western writers. He likewise ends with the wrong conclusion that since William of Tyre based his ascription of Monothelitism to the Maronites on the writing of Saʿid Ibn Batriq (Eutychius), the Monothelite heretic Marun mentioned by William was a certain Nestorian monk of Edessa named John Marun and not the John Marun the Maronites believe to be their first patriarch, who died in 707.[4] Even if we agree that William of Tyre copied what Saʿid Ibn Batriq wrote about John Marun, it is certain that his reference to the Maronites as Monothelites was not copied from Ibn Batriq, for there is a sharp difference between his account and that of Ibn Batriq on this point. It is also commonplace that William of Tyre, a clergyman and writer, who spent most of his life in Syria and traveled there must have had some knowledge about the faith of the Maronites. It is also certain that if in his own twelfth century the Maronites were not Monothelites, William of Tyre would have not labeled them as such. Furthermore, when William stated that the heresy, the doctrine of one will in Christ, of John Marun and his followers may be learned from the Sixth Council which assembled against them and condemned them, he

certainly meant the Monothelites at large, whose doctrine the Maronites embraced, not John Marun in person or the Maronites as a specific body. But unfortunately this statement was misunderstood by Maronite writers and also by Crawford, who arrived at the conclusion that the Sixth Council was not assembled against the Maronites and that there is no indication the Maronites were condemned by that council. But Monothelitism was condemned by that council, and logically, those who maintained this doctrine, the Maronites being an example, were condemned because they did so. Whether William of Tyre copied Sa'id Ibn Batriq or not, the fact remains that the Maronites were Monothelites as we have demonstrated previously. Unfortunately, Crawford had no access to original Syriac and Arabic sources, hence his faulty premise and conclusion.

William of Tyre states that the Maronites, their patriarch, and several bishops offered their submission to the Roman Catholic Church through the Latin Patriarch Aimerick. This submission is not hard to explain. Like other Christian minorities, the Maronites must have suffered inconvenience and persecution first from the Fatimids of Egypt, who occupied Syria, and later from the Saljuk Turks who expelled the Fatimids from Syria in 1071, after Alp Arslan defeated the Byzantine army at Malazgird (Manzikert). When the Crusaders arrived in Syria, occupying its major cities and reaching Arqa near Tripoli in Lebanon in the spring of 1099, the Maronites went out to welcome them and must have found an ally in these coreligionists who they hoped would remove the persecutors' yoke from their necks.[5] It is probable that the Maronites were primarily motivated to offer their submission to the Church of Rome in hope of standing under the protective shield of the Crusaders. The profession of the faith of Chalcedon could not have been a strong motive for their submission because, as William of Tyre informs us, these Maronites were heretics.

The first contact the Maronites made with the Crusaders was in 1099, but they did not offer their submission to the Church of Rome until the year 1182, according to William. Unfortunately, he offers no information other than a general statement that the Maronites, their patriarch, and some of their bishops offered their allegiance to the Church of Rome. He also supplies no information as to the identity of this patriarch or the motives and the conditions under which the Maronites offered such allegiance. In substance we have no evidence, no document in the form of a letter or papal bull, to support the idea of the Maronites' submission to the See of Rome. However, we learn from a letter addressed by Bishop al-Qila'i to Maronite Patriarch Shim'un

(Simon) al-Hadathi in the year 1494, that the Maronites' submission to the popes of Rome dates back to the year 1100. Al-Qilaʿi writes that when the Crusaders reached the vicinity of Tripoli, Maronite Patriarch Yusuf al-Jirjisi, upon hearing the news of their arrival, sent a delegation to Rome asking for his confirmation as a patriarch by the Roman pontiff. The letter claims that the Maronite delegation was joined by other delegates sent by Godfrey, Latin King of Jerusalem, probably to support the patriarch's petition for confirmation; as a result, in the year 1100 Pope Pascal II sent his confirmation of the Maronite patriarch and conferred upon him a staff and a mitre.[6] This claim of al-Qilaʿi has no historical foundation. Upon reading his letter we discover that he did not state that Patriarch al-Jirjisi received his confirmation from the pope, but only that he requested it. And there is no evidence that Pope Pascal II ever received such a request from this Maronite patriarch or that he confirmed him in office. Al-Qilaʿi contradicts himself in the same letter to Patriarch Shimʿun al-Hadathi when he tells the patriarch that fifteen letters deposited at the archives of the Maronite patriarchate testify to the faith of the ancient Maronites. These letters, he asserts, had been preserved for the last two hundred and eighty two years. What al-Qilaʿi wants to establish is that the faith of the Maronites was substantiated in the letters of former popes, two hundred eighty two years prior to the time he wrote his letter to Patriarch Simon al-Hadathi in 1494. This sets the date in 1212, one year before Patriarch Irmia (Jeremiah) al-Amshiti visited Rome to offer his submission to the pope.[7] This is clearly demonstrated by the letter of Pope Paul II to Maronite Patriarch Butrus (Peter) al-Hadathi in August 1469, cited by al-Qilaʿi himself. In this letter Paul states that the first Roman pontiff to offer confirmation to newly elected Maronite patriarchs was the thirteenth-century Pope Innocent III. He does not mention Pope Pascal II.[8] We also have the testimony of Maronite Patriarch Mikha'il al-Ruzzi, who states in 1578 that if a new Maronite patriarch were elected he should immediately request the holy pontiff to offer him his confirmation as had been the custom of "our predecessors since the time of Irmia."[9] This is also supported by Patriarch al-Duwayhi, who states that the Maronite Church had been in communion with the Church of Rome since the time of Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti at the beginning of the thirteenth century.[10]

There is no evidence that prior to Innocent III (1198–1216) any pope had established relations with the Maronite Church and community for the purpose of converting them to Roman Catholicism. When Innocent III became pope he attempted to effect many reforms within the church and to extend the authority of the Church of Rome to the

churches of the East, including the Maronite Church.[11] Obviously, this church was the pope's earliest target because it had made some gestures to recognize the authority of the Church of Rome from 1099 on. We learn from the letter of Innocent III, dated February 1, 1216, that this pope must have realized that the Maronites had ceased to recognize the supremacy of Rome, for they still retained their Monothelite faith and other doctrines contrary to those professed by the Church of Rome.[12] Therefore, he sent Cardinal Peter of Saint Marcellus to investigate their faith and to reestablish their previous allegiance to Rome. We do not know when Cardinal Peter arrived in Lebanon, but it must have been in or before the years 1203–1204, several years before Patriarch al-Amshiti departed for Rome. According to the letter of Innocent III to this patriarch, Peter arrived in Tripoli and was received by Maronite Patriarch al-Amshiti, several bishops, priests, deacons, and a crowd of lay people, who pledged their allegiance to the Church of Rome, to Pope Innocent III, and to his successors. The cardinal also brought to their attention several matters of their faith not in conformity with those of the Church of Rome and asked them to correct them.[13] This visit by the papal delegation together with the invitation of Innocent to al-Amshiti to attend the Lateran Council (April 1213) were some of the reasons which prompted this Maronite patriarch to visit Rome and personally offer allegiance to the pope. The pretext given by al-Qilaʿi and copied by Faustus Nairon that the reason for this visit was the conversion of Maronite Patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani (1300?) and a group of Maronites to Monophysitism is anachronistic.[14] Al-Duwayhi rightly observes that this incident of al-Banhrani could not have happened in the time of the Patriarch al-Amshiti because of the difference in time between those two patriarchs.[15] Apparently al-Qilaʿi confused Irmia al-Amshiti with another patriarch, Irmia al-Dimlisawi (1272–1297), who is also reported to have visited Rome and to have offered homage to the pope.[16]

Upon receiving the pope's invitation in April 1213, to attend the Lateran Council, al-Amshiti departed from Lebanon arriving in Rome in the same year. He appeared before the pope and knelt before him, asking with great humility for blessings upon him and his people. The pope comforted him and conferred upon him many ecclesiastical privileges.[17] The patriarch attended the Lateran Council which assembled in November 1215, but there is no evidence that he participated in its deliberations. Before the council adjourned al-Amshiti departed from Rome in January 1216, arriving in Tripoli in March of the same year. He was accompanied by Cardinal William, the papal delegate sent to reexamine the faith of the Maronites and their allegiance to the Church of Rome.

According to al-Qila'i, the patriarch and the cardinal were received in Tripoli by the patriarch's deputy Bishop Theodore, other bishops, clergy, and a crowd of people. After conveying the benediction of the pope to them, the patriarch displayed the bull he had received and asked the people whether they were ready to accept what was written in it. All those present, including two hundred fifty Maronite laymen, answered with one voice, "we do, we do, this is our faith for which we die." When the interpreter in the cardinal's company explained to him these proceedings, the cardinal ordered the Gospel and the Sacraments to be brought to him and asked those present to swear on them allegiance to the Church of Rome. When they were brought, the people, in the presence of the cardinal, swore their unity and obedience to the Church of Rome and its pontiffs. After the administration of the oath the cardinal presented the patriarch with the ring and pallium conferred upon him by the pope. The people also pledged that whenever a new patriarch was elected, he would proceed personally to Rome or send a delegate on his behalf to obtain confirmation of his office from the pope.[18]

Just as significant as the patriarch's journey to Rome is the letter which Pope Innocent III addressed to him after his departure from Rome. We do not know his reason for writing the letter, but judging by its content the pope perhaps wanted to remind the patriarch of the adverse doctrines which Cardinal Peter of Saint Marcellus (the pope's delegate) had detected in the teachings of the Maronite Church and to instruct him and his clergy to follow the rules and customs of the Church of Rome. This letter, the first to be addressed by a Roman pontiff to a Maronite patriarch, is of such great importance in showing the relationship of the Church of Rome to the Maronite Church that it deserves full elucidation. It is a significant document which also sheds light on the faith of the Maronites and the attitude of the Church of Rome toward them. The letter was signed by the pope, twelve cardinals, and five bishops.

The first thing of note in the letter is that Pope Innocent III addresses Irmia as a patriarch or a primate: "Innocent, the servant of the servants of God, to the venerable brethren Jeremiah (Irmia) the Patriarch or Primate, the archpriests, bishops, clerics, dignitaries and the Maronite people."[19] By mentioning the two titles of patriarch or primate, the pope had no intention of recognizing Irmia as more than a head bishop. The term primate he uses is equivalent to that of catholicos, a church rank lower than patriarch. Furthermore, the pope did not address Irmia as the patriarch of Antioch and thus refutes the allegation of Maronite Patriarch Bulus (Paul) Mas'ad (d. 1890) that the Maronite patriarch is "the only true patriarch of Antioch."[20] We shall see later that

the title "Patriarch of Antioch" which Maronite patriarchs add to their names is not supported by church canon or tradition. The pope also recognizes that despite their past allegiance to the Church of Rome, the Maronites were still Monothelites holding a doctrine contrary to that of the Church of Rome, that they had gone astray from the true faith (meaning the faith of the Church of Rome) and that through divine providence they returned to the right path. He writes:

> For you were formerly like wandering sheep, not properly understanding that Christ had but one bride and one holy dove, that is, the Catholic Church, that Christ is the only true Shepherd, and after Him and through Him Peter was his Apostle and Vicar to whom the Lord had thrice committed the feeding of His sheep whose faith and that of his successors, the Roman Pontiffs, cannot fail, as the Lord had promised that He shall confirm his brethren in their faith.[21]

The pope leaves no room to doubt that the Maronites had been in error in taking up Monothelitism. This judgment is even more explicitly voiced as he proceeds to inform the patriarch that when Cardinal Peter of Saint Marcellus was in Irmia's locality, the Maronites converted to the true shepherd, acknowledging the pope as the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church and Vicar of Jesus Christ. He also states that the patriarch and a number of his bishops and clergy and lay people, in the presence of Cardinal Peter, swore obedience to the Church of Rome, to the pope and to his successors. The pope also informs the patriarch of the errors and impurities in their faith that the cardinal found and bids them henceforward to adhere to the faith of the Church of Rome. The pope affirms that the cardinal bade them to acknowledge that:

> The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son as He proceeds from the Father, that they should perform baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity, once only, not three times, that bishops alone have the right to offer confirmation, that in preparing the Holy chrism you should use no ingredients other than balsam and olive oil . . . and that you should believe in two wills in Christ—a divine will and a human will.[22]

Finally, the pope grants the patriarch the pallium, not directly, but authorizing the Latin patriarch of Antioch to bestow it upon him.[23]

There is little doubt that in the thirteenth century, when this letter was written, the Church of Rome considered the Maronite Church a "Monothelite heretical" church and that, through providence, it was converted to Catholicism. It is not only the doctrine of one will in Christ

but many doctrines and traditions enumerated by the pope in his letter that separated the Maronite Church from the Church of Rome. A thorough examination of these doctrines and traditions shows them to be identical to those of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch which is called "Monophysite" or "Jacobite." The doctrine of one will in Christ and the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone are both cardinal doctrines of this church. According to the order of baptism performed by this church, the baptizing clergy immerses the baptized thrice in the water, reciting each time, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Pope Innocent III instructs the Maronite patriarch that it should be recited once only. Furthermore, the priests in the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch have the right to confirm the baptized with the holy chrism, which is considered one of the seven sacraments. Finally, in this church the compound of the holy chrism contains no ingredients other than the balsam and olive oil specified by the pope. These traditions and doctrines confirm the belief that the Maronite Church was by tradition a part of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch and that its profession of the Chalcedonian faith was in appearance only, not a genuine adoption of that faith.

The letter of Innocent III marks the beginning of the policy of the Church of Rome to Latinize those Eastern churches who submitted themselves to the authority of the Roman pontiffs. In addition to the doctrines and traditions already mentioned, Pope Innocent III informed the Maronite patriarch that his delegate Cardinal Peter of Saint Marcellus has further ordered the Maronite Church to follow such Latin customs as the use of Latin vestments, announcement of bans three times before solemnizing marriages, the use of azym (unleavened bread) in the Eucharist, confession at least once a year before a priest and taking holy communion at least once a year, substitution of brass or steel bells for wooden gongs, use of silver chalices rather than copper or wooden ones, inclusion of new saints in church calendars, adoption of the orders of baptism and other orders from the Church of Rome, and finally adoption of the Latin liturgy of Rome.[24] This letter refutes the allegations of the Maronites in regard to their perpetual adherence to the faith of the Church of Rome.

The Maronites have always been unhappy about this letter and have tried either to overlook the greater part of it or to offer new explanations of the intentions of its author. Al-Duwayhi claims that the context of the letter shows that Pope Innocent III meant it for the Greeks (Malkites) not the Maronites. He states that it was these Greeks who offered their submission to the Roman pontiff through Cardinal Peter of

Saint Marcellus because they did not profess that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Al-Duwayhi further points out that the pope received distorted information because the cardinal had no knowledge of Oriental languages and erroneously labeled the Maronites as Monothelites. Finally, al-Duwayhi avers that in writing that "you were formerly like wandering sheep," the pope was referring to the submission of the Maronites of Lebanon and Jerusalem only, not all the Maronites, to the Church of Rome through Aimerick, the Latin patriarch. Al-Duwayhi emphatically states that the Maronites had never fallen into heresy, and that those who claim they did or that they were restored to the true "Catholic" faith are telling a lie.[25] Obviously, al-Duwayhi denies that the Maronites were Monothelites wandering like sheep and that through providence they were converted to Catholicism. The text of Innocent's letter, which had been quoted by other popes after him to prove that what he said of the Maronites was true, is sufficient evidence of its truthfulness. Innocent III had no reason to distort the truth about the Maronites. It is also difficult to believe that Cardinal Peter gave false information to him. If he had done so, Cardinal William, whom Pope Innocent sent to the Maronites in the company of Patriarch al-Amshiti, would not have shown such great suspicion of Maronite beliefs and intentions toward the Church of Rome. Cardinal William had interpreters with him who explained the proceedings of the assembly when the Maronite patriarch, his bishops, clergy, and laymen assembled to pledge their allegiance to the pope. It was after he became convinced of the good intentions of the Maronites toward the Church of Rome that the cardinal asked for the Gospel and the Sacraments to be brought so the Maronites could corroborate their allegiance with a divine oath. It is inappropriate to accuse Cardinal Peter and the Roman pontiff of distortion and falsehood.[26] We find no Maronite accusing these popes of falsehood or ignorance. In his letter to the Maronite patriarch, the secretary to Pope Innocent IV (1353–1361) quotes the letter of Pope Innocent III and advised the patriarch, his bishops, clergy and lay people "who were recently converted to the faith" to follow his instructions and act according to the tenets of the Church of Rome.[27] On July 3, 1526, Pope Clement VII wrote to the Maronite patriarch advising him wholeheartedly to keep himself and his people in the purity of the "Catholic" faith and abide by their submission to the Church of Rome since the time of his predecessors Innocent III and Eugene IV. A letter to the same effect was also addressed in 1577 by Pope Gregory XIII to the Maronite patriarch, in which he refers to the letters of the former popes, beginning with Innocent III.[28]

From the death of patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti in 1230 to the middle of the fourteenth century, historical information about the Maronite Church and its relations with the Church of Rome is very inadequate. The main source about this period is *Madihat Kisrawan,* commonly known as *Zajaliyya* by al-Qilaʿi. Despite the historical anachronism of the events in the *Zajaliyya,* Maronite writer Rev. Bulus Qara'ali considers it a "glorious page in the history of Lebanon and the Maronite denomination," and recognizes its author as the "first Maronite historian."[29]

In this work al-Qilaʿi informs us that the Maronite people remained in peace until they were disturbed by two monks: one from the Monastery of Yanuh, the other from the Monastery of Nbuh. These monks renounced their "Catholic" faith and began to preach the Monophysite doctrine among the Maronites, converting many of them to their doctrine. Their efforts were so effective that one of their converts was Maronite Patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani (d. 1300), a native of the village of Banhran. They were subsequently joined by many Maronites, with the result that the Maronite community became divided into two factions: one following the patriarch, the other remaining steadfast in the "Catholic" faith. When the pope heard of the conversion of the Patriarch and many Maronites to Monophysitism he sent a delegate to the patriarch to have him renounce his new faith. The patriarch refused to meet with the papal delegate because he had already professed the faith of the Syrian Orthodox Church,[30] which Qara'ali unjustifiably labels as "the Jacobite heresy."[31] The party which remained loyal to the Maronite Church elected a new patriarch, Irmia al-Dimlisawi, in 1282, and al-Qilaʿi confuses him with Irmia al-Amshiti. Because of the division the Maronite Church must have suffered serious dissension. In the following year Lebanon was invaded by contingents of Turkomans by order of the Mamluk state in Egypt; they attacked Jibbat Bsharri and Ihden, destroying the latter's citadel. In August of that year they occupied the village of al-Hadath and took Patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani captive.[32] It was probably about this time that the governor of Jubayl prevailed upon Patriarch Irmia al-Dimlisawi to journey to Rome and obtain absolution from the pope for the Maronite people.[33] The governor must have felt that by their defection to Monophysitism the Maronites had committed a sin which required papal absolution.[34]

The conversion of Patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani and many Maronites to Monophysitism is not hard to explain. In the seventh century the monks of the Monastery of Marun in Syria who had adopted Monothelitism began to convert many Syrian Monophysites, those who believed

in *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* to their faith. Monothelitism also spread into Lebanon, where converts formed a distinct Maronite community. The conversion of these Monophysites was easy since Monothelitism (the belief in one will in Christ), like the belief in one nature in Him, was a cardinal doctrine already held by these converts. Moreover, the Maronites in Lebanon constituted but a small and insignificant minority. In fact, Orthodox Syrians, who held the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature,* formed the majority of the population in Lebanon before and after they rejected the Council of Chalcedon (451). This is evidenced by the great number of their dioceses, bishoprics, churches, and monasteries in Lebanon. The Viscount Philip Tarrazi has painstakingly described these institutions, attesting to the number and influence of the Monophysites in Lebanon.[35] According to Father Henri Lammens, the Maronite denomination did not achieve a great degree of significance until the middle of the fifteenth century in Lebanon. The majority of the Maronites were still living in the two districts of Jubayl and al-Batrun in northern Lebanon. Therefore, those "numberless Christians" seen in Lebanon villages and towns by Ludolf de Suchem (cited by Lammens) in the fourteenth century could not all have been Maronites.[36] A great number of these Lebanese were living in the village of Yanuh, where the Maronites had built a monastery named after the Holy Virgin Mary, used as a residence by Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti and Shimʿun (Simon) II in the thirteenth century.[37] It is to this Monastery of Yanuh that al-Qilaʿi refers in his *Zajaliyya,* stating that one of its monks began to preach Monophysitism. However, he makes a grave error in his claim that this monk and others from Nbuh preached that Christ had no rational soul because His divinity had taken the place of His rational soul[38] Al-Qilaʿi apparently confused the doctrine of Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, who claimed that Christ was without a rational soul because His divinity has taken its place, with the Cyrillian doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos.* It is the latter doctrine that Patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani must have adopted, not the heretical doctrine of Apollinaris.[39] If we follow al-Qilaʿi's narrative further, it becomes apparent that the doctrine of the Syrian Orthodox Church must have spread throughout many parts of Lebanon, especially in the north of the country where several villages converted to this doctrine. Furthermore, many Syrian Orthodox monks went to live in the Qadisha valley and the Faradis Monastery near the village of Ban. In 1242 these monks were only about forty in number but must have been so effective in preaching the faith of their church that in the ensuing years Patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani and many others joined the Syrian Church.[40] The Reverend Qara'ali is of the

opinion that Luqa was not a Maronite convert to the faith of the Syrian Church but "like Nuh of Baqufa was one of the Syrian Jacobite patriarchs in Lebanon."[41] It appears that al-Qila'i is correct in saying that Luqa al-Banhrani was a Maronite patriarch, as the Syrian Orthodox Church had no patriarch by this name.[42]

We have seen that at the beginning of the thirteenth century some relationship was established between the Maronite Church and the pontiffs of the Church of Rome. How strong and effective this relationship was is hard to determine; it depended greatly on the attitude of individual popes. It is certain that their dealings with the Maronite Church and community at least until the end of the sixteenth century were not uniform. The knowledge of the popes and their associates of the Eastern churches, including the Maronite Church, was meager. They were primarily thought of as separated churches which should be restored to the Church of Rome and submit to the supremacy of the pope. For this reason we find Pope Innocent III instructing the Maronite Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti to follow the Latin practices of the Church of Rome. This Latinization of the Maronite Church and its subjugation to the supremacy of Rome continued throughout the fourteenth century. Ludolf de Suchem, who visited Syria and Lebanon in 1336, states that he saw Latin bishops ordaining bishops for the Maronites "Eorum episcopos ab archiepiscopia latinis vidi consecrati."[43] However, it was not until the middle of the fifteenth century that Fra Gryphon defended the traditions of the Maronite Church before the Apostolic See of Rome, thus saving them from becoming completely Latinized.[44]

Despite the relationship between the Maronite Church and the Church of Rome and Latinization efforts of the latter, the Maronite Church retained its original faith of Monothelitism. It also kept other principles of faith and rituals which were identical with those of the Syrian Orthodox Church, such as the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, the recital of the Trisagion with the phrase *Thou who wast Crucified for us,* baptism in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost three times instead of one, and the veneration of the saints of the Syrian Church. There is no evidence from this period of the history of the Maronite Church that the Church of Rome was able to achieve anything other than Maronite acceptance of the supremacy of the pope. In fact, there is little evidence that the Apostolic See of Rome conferred upon the Maronite patriarch any privilege which would distinguish him from other patriarchs in the East who accepted the supremacy of Rome. When Irmia al-Amshiti visited Rome to offer his obedience, Pope Innocent III considered him only a catholicos, second in rank to a

patriarch. The Maronite patriarch did not assume and did not have the right to assume the title "Patriarch of Antioch." However, in 1268 Pope Alexander IV conferred the title "Patriarch of Antioch" on Maronite Patriarch Shimʿun (Simon) II as a reward for his services in offering asylum to the Latin subjects who escaped the ravages of war caused by the invasion of Syria by the Mamluk Sultan al-Zahir Baybars (1223–1277), who defeated the Crusaders and the Mongols at Ayn Jalut (Goliath's Spring) near Nazareth.[45] In fact, Pope Alexander did not confer on the Maronite patriarch more than an honorary title as a reward for his assistance.

The loss of Syria to Baybars and the eviction of the last Crusaders from it nearly cut off the relations between the Church of Rome and the Maronites. Not until the first half of the fifteenth century did the Church of Rome, through the efforts of the Franciscan monks, begin to revive its operations among the Eastern churches, this time with the avowed purpose of converting them to Roman Catholicism. The weakness of the Byzantine church and state and the ever present Ottoman danger must have prompted both Pope Eugene IV (1431–1447) and Byzantine Emperor John VIII (1425–1448) to contemplate a union between the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. The political events in the Balkans, particularly the occupation of Thesalonica by the Ottoman Sultan Murad II in May 1430 must have worried the pope for he asked John VIII for an immediate meeting. John VIII responded and a council met in Ferrara, Italy, in March 1438; however, because of the spread of the plague in Ferrara, the council moved to Florence on January 10, 1439. After several months deliberation on four major points—the procession of the Holy Ghost, the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, suffering in the purgatory, and the supremacy of the pope—the council declared the union of the two Churches of Rome and Constantinople on July 6, 1439.[46] The meeting of the council in Florence prompted Maronite Patriarch Yuhanna (John) al-Jaji (d. 1445) to appoint Fra Juan from the Franciscan Order of Friars Minor, who had completed his service in the East and was leaving for Europe, as his delegate to the pope. His mission was to obtain from the Roman pontiff the patriarch's pallium and confirmation as the patriarch of the Maronite Church. Fra Juan also carried letters to the pope from the patriarch and Maronite dignitaries pledging allegiance to him and willingness to agree to whatever decisions were taken by the Council of Florence. According to al-Qilaʿi, Fra Juan returned to Lebanon carrying a mitre and a letter from the pope confirming al-Jaji as the "patriarch of Antioch."[47] When Fra Juan arrived in Tripoli in October 1439, many

Maronites went out to welcome him. The welcoming crowds must have aroused the suspicion of the Muslims, who thought that the native Christians of Lebanon had connived with the Greeks and the Latins to recapture Syria from the Mamluk Sultan of Egypt. The Muslim authorities arrested Fra Juan and his companions and put them in jail, but they were released on bail through the efforts of some influential Maronites. Fra Juan visited the patriarch and invested him with the pope's pallium and then left for Beirut, where he disappeared. The disappearance of Fra Juan and his companions enraged the governor of Tripoli, who immediately sent his men to arrest those who bailed the prisoners. When they failed to find them they burned their homes and killed many people, including a few monks who were in the service of the patriarch, and sent others in chains to Tripoli. At that time the patriarch left his residence in the Monastery of Mifuq and moved to live in the Monastery of Qanubin in the valley of Qadisha in Jibbat Bsharri under the protection of the Muqaddam (Governor) Ya'qub of Bsharri.[48]

After Fra Juan disappeared, the Maronite patriarch began looking for another messenger to send to the pope to acknowledge the receipt of his letter, express his gratitude for his confirmation and to restate his obedience to the pope's authority. The patriarch found another Franciscan, Fra Peter de Ferrara, whom he delegated to the pope with a letter in August 1440, in which he reitertated his obedience and acceptance of the decision of the Council of Florence. He also informed the pope of the suffering and humiliation he and his people received at the hands of their adversaries when he received the confirmation the pope had sent with Fra Juan. He assured the pope that he and his people would endeavor even to the extent of shedding their blood to obey him and the Church of Rome. Finally, the patriarch pleaded with the pope to send his people learned men to teach them the true faith, meaning the faith of the Church of Rome. The pope replied in a letter dated December 12, 1441, assuring the patriarch of his confidence in the allegiance of the Maronites to the Roman See. He also informs him that he has delegated the same Fra Peter de Ferrara and another Franciscan, Antonius de Troia, to explain the teachings of the Church of Rome to the Maronites.[49] In 1444 de Troia returned to Rome, and he must have reported the dire need of the Maronites for teachers for the pope decided to expand the Roman Catholic missions in Syria. In the same year Peter de Ferrara was officially appointed a papal representative to the Maronites and the Malkites.[50]

The appeal of the Maronite patriarch to the pope to send the Maronites learned men to teach them the "true" faith indicates that the

relationship of the Apostolic See of Rome with the Maronites regarding their faith was superficial, and that the main objective of the popes was to place the Maronites under their authority and to make them acknowledge their supremacy. There is no indication that, as a result of the sporadic missions the popes sent to the Maronite Church, this church had changed its Monothelitic belief as well as other major dogmas and rituals. The Maronites were Monothelites and remained so until the very end of the sixteenth century. However, though the Maronites of Lebanon and Jerusalem had accepted papal supremacy without changing their faith since the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Maronites of Cyprus were brought under the authority of Rome only in the middle of the fifteenth century, according to a bull issued by Pope Eugene IV, in 1445.[51] In this bull the pope states that he delegated Andrew, archbishop of Rhodes, to Cyprus and other parts of the Eastern countries to convince the Malkites, Armenians, and "Jacobite" denominations to accept and join the unity of the Latin and Greek Churches effected at the Council of Florence. In other words, the pope considered these churches as "separatists" and desired that they reunite with Rome, but it was not until the seventeenth century that part of the Eastern churches did so.[52] The most important part of this bull is the pope's statement that after intensive effort, Archbishop Andrew was able to bring into the fold Nestorian Bishop Timothy and Maronite Bishop Elias, who with his parishioners was "stained with the blemishes of the teaching of Macarius, who professed only one will in the Lord."[53] The pope further relates that Bishop Elias, his clergy, and people publicly professed the faith of the Church of Rome at the Church of Saint Sophia in Cyprus in the presence of other denominations. Then Archbishop Andrew sent Isaac, a priest and disciple of Bishop Elias, to Rome whereupon Isaac renounced the teaching (Monothelitism) of Macarius publicly at the Lateran Church in Rome and professed the teaching of the Church of Rome.[54]

It is evident from this testimony that the Maronites were Monothelites. Because of their Monothelitism many Latin writers (particularly Horace Justinian, the compiler of the acts of the Council of Florence) have accused them of heresy.[55] Maronite Patriarch al-Duwayhi attempts to refute the accusations of these writers, but he is unconvincing. He does not deny that Maronite Bishop of Cyprus Elias and his priest, Isaac, publicly renounced Monothelitism, but he accuses the papal delegate, Archbishop Andrew of Rhodes, for not telling the pope the truth about the faith of the Maronites of Cyprus. Al-Duwayhi claims that these Maronites were under the jurisdiction of Patriarch Yuhanna al-Jaji in Lebanon, who was of orthodox faith.[56] Al-Duwayhi means that this

patriarch and his people were not Monothelites. This is not so, for the Maronites remained Monothelites until more than a century later. Furthermore, in defending the orthodoxy of his people al-Duwayhi seems to confuse the external elements of church usage with the intrinsic principles of the faith. He quotes a letter of Fra Gryphon, (to be discussed shortly) written in 1469 which states that the Maronite clergy in Cyprus, Rhodes, Beirut, and Jerusalem had, from ancient times, meaning the thirteenth century, worn Latin vestments, signed the cross in the Latin manner, and celebrated the holy Eucharist as was done in Latin churches.[57] These practices, however, do not mean that the Maronites completely adopted the faith of the Church of Rome, or renounced their Monothelite faith or Monophysite doctrines. In the words of a contemporary writer the Maronites were still Monothelites.[58]

22

The Mission of Fra Gryphon and Other Franciscans to the Maronites

In the period following the Council of Florence, the Church of Rome appears to have charged the Franciscan monks in Syria and Palestine with increasing responsibility in attending to the affairs of the Maronite Church. Prominent among these Franciscans was the Flemish monk Fra Gryphon (d. 1475).

Gryphon received his education in Paris, where he studied theology and Greek. Like many devout monks he had a burning desire to visit the holy places in Jerusalem, journeying to Palestine toward the end of 1442. Two years later he returned to Rome, accompanied by a Maronite delegation to Pope Eugene IV. The delegation's purpose was probably to appeal to the pope to extend assistance to the Maronite Church and community. The pope responded and as related earlier appointed Peter de Ferrara as his delegate to the Maronites and the Malkites in 1444. Gryphon must have returned to Palestine with Peter de Ferrara in 1444, but six years later he was transferred to the Franciscan mission in Lebanon, arriving in Beirut in 1450 with Fra Francis of Barcelona, who was to be his lifelong companion.[1]

A zealous Roman Catholic, Gryphon was disturbed to see that so many Christians in the East were not in communion with the Church of Rome, and he believed it was his responsibility to bring them back to the Roman Catholic fold. To achieve this aim Gryphon diligently studied for many years the two languages necessary to deal with the Christians of

the East, Arabic and Syriac. But his primary responsibility was the Maronites of Lebanon. Franciscan sources indicate that Fra Gryphon was very active in building new churches in Lebanon and in eliminating many "errores ablegavit" in the Maronite Church. Father Lammens states that these "errores ablegavit" could not mean the elimination of errors in the faith of the Maronites because those writers who deny the perpetual "Catholic" faith of the Maronites themselves admit that after the Council of Florence the Maronites maintained this "Catholic" faith, meaning the faith of the Church of Rome. He implies that what is meant by "errores" in this context are those errors related to "moral matters," not doctrinal issues connected with the faith of the Maronites.[2] Obviously, Lammens's objective is to absolve the Maronites from Monothelitism, which is considered a heresy by the Church of Rome.

Other Roman Catholic sources regarding Fra Gryphon contradict both the Franciscan sources Lammens quotes and his conclusions on this matter. According to Bishop Marcus of Lisbon, a historian of the Franciscan Order who is quoted by al-Duwayhi, it was Fra Gryphon who restored the Maronites to the "true" faith and brought them to obedience to the Church of Rome. Marcus of Lisbon relates the activities of both Gryphon and Fra Francis in teaching and baptizing many "non-believers," meaning non-Roman Catholics. Marcus relates a miracle which Gryphon performed by moving the sun back from the West to the East so that a skeptical Lebanese dignitary would believe in Jesus Christ. Finally, he states that Pope Calistus ordained Fra Gryphon a bishop and later a patriarch for the Maronites.[3]

Another Roman Catholic who associates the conversion of the Maronites to Roman Catholicism with Gryphon's miracle of moving the sun from the West to the East is the Italian Prelate Mark, bishop of Porto, who writes that the Maronites were "heretics and idolaters, who were converted in 1450 by Gryphon, who baptized them with their prince after he miraculously moved the sun which was about to set several degrees to the East."[4] Al-Duwayhi attempts to refute these statements as incorrect. It is most unlikely that Gryphon was ordained a patriarch of the Maronites or that he moved the sun from West to East. Al-Duwayhi also produces a full text of a letter from Gryphon to the Maronites in which he commends their faith and their obedience to the Apostolic See of Rome,[5] but he contends that Fra Gryphon did not guide the Maronites to the faith of the Church of Rome. If we consider this letter of Fra Gryphon prima facie, al-Duwayhi might appear to be correct, but in his letter Gryphon emphasizes not the particulars of the faith held by the Maronites but their submission to the supremacy of the

Church of Rome. In fact, his intention is most evident when at the beginning of his letter he stresses the Petrine doctrine. In one instance in his letter Gryphon relates that when the Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti returned from Rome to Lebanon, he and his bishops and many lay people assembled in Tripoli and pledged to follow the faith of the Church of Rome. But he never mentions that the Maronites in his time had revised their religious books or faith to harmonize them with the faith of the Church of Rome. Gryphon, who lived for a long time in the East among the Maronites, must have found (as did Roman Catholic missionaries after him) that many Maronite teachings were not in conformity with those of the Church of Rome and consequently made an effort to eliminate such "errores ablegavit." We have decisive testimony in this regard by the Franciscan delegate to the Maronites, Fra Suriano (to be discussed later), who affirmed that Fra Gryphon "guided the Maronites to profess two natures in Christ—one divine, the other human,"[6] which meant they were Monophysites.

Gryphon went a second time to Rome, perhaps between 1455 and 1458 in the time of Pope Calixtus III, but there is no information about this journey. However, when Maronite Patriarch Ya'qub al-Hadathi died in 1458, his brother Butrus (Peter) al-Hadathi (1458–1492), known as Ibn Hassan, was elected patriarch in his place. Maronite clergy and other dignitaries chose Fra Gryphon to carry a message to Pope Paul II, and in it they expressed their obedience and that of the new patriarch to the See of Rome; they requested the pope's confirmation of the new patriarch.[7] Fra Gryphon carried the message and, accompanied by Fra Simon and Fra Alexander, arrived in Rome in the first half of 1469. Upon receiving this message, the pope, who must have been suspicious of the Maronites' beliefs, ordered an investigation of the life, education, and faith of the newly-elected patriarch and of the veracity of the faith of his subjects. Although Gryphon defended the faith of the Maronite patriarch and his church to the pope, he was still unsure if the Maronites were truthful in their claim of adhering to the Church of Rome and her teachings. Had he been positive about the beliefs of the Maronite Church and its attitude toward the Church of Rome, he would not have sent a letter from Rome to the Maronites explaining their relationship with Rome since the time Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti visited Rome at the very beginning of the thirteenth century.[8] After describing this relationship between the two churches, he would not have closed his letter by stating that "we ask God that you would believe and agree accordingly and that what I have told our Lord the pope about you is true."[9] Such closing remarks could only be interpreted to mean that Gryphon was

hoping that the Maronites would remain loyal to the teachings of the Church of Rome. We also learn from the pope's letter to the newly elected patriarch, dated August 13, 1469, that he was not very sure about the Maronites' faith. In this letter the pope elucidates the teachings of the Church of Rome, stating his certainty that the patriarch was ready to accept his instruction and those of his church.[10] Now if the pope were sure of the patriarch's and the Maronite Church's faith, he would have been more positive about it in his letter to the patriarch. Be that as it may, Gryphon's main purpose was to bring the Maronite Church closer to the Church of Rome. Father Lammens informs us that Gryphon was successful in "rooting out all of their doctrinal and religious 'impurities' and in restoring the Maronites faith to its splendor."[11] What Lammens means by "impurities" and "errors" in this context are the many Eastern religious customs which the Maronite Church had been practicing, such as the right of the priests to anoint the baptized with the holy chrism, to administer the Holy Eucharist to infants after their baptism, to use reserve Sacraments in Lent, and to administer both elements, the bread and wine, on ordinary days. All of these customs were essential customs in the Syrian Orthodox and other Eastern churches before groups of them converted to Catholicism and succumbed to the Latinization policy carried out relatively successfully by the missionaries of Rome. It is true that Fra Gryphon pleaded with Rome to allow the Maronites to retain some of their Eastern religious rites, but as we learn from Father Lammens, he was also successful in rooting out many of these rites and traditions, and ultimately replacing them with Latin ones. In fact, Gryphon's opinion of the Maronites and other Eastern churches was not different from that of the Church of Rome: they were "heretical" churches which had separated themselves from the "Mother Church" and should be won back to the fold.

According to Lammens, the "reforms" attempted by Gryphon were met with resistance. He states that a small group of Maronites believed Gryphon's missionary zeal was untimely. However, the opposition of this group to the "reforms" was short-lived, thanks to the efforts of one of the muqaddams (district governors) of north Lebanon, who, together with many Maronites, converted to the Syrian Orthodox Church and embraced her doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos*.[12]

In the fifteenth century, the Maronites were, in religious matters, under the jurisdiction of their patriarch, who resided at the Qanubin Monastery, but in secular matters they were ruled by muqaddams (a hereditary office), who were autonomous and mainly responsible for the Mamluks of Egypt, who frequently interfered in the internal affairs of

Lebanon. Muqaddams ruled over several districts in north Lebanon. Prominent among them is the Muqaddam of Bsharri Abd al-Munʿim Ayyub (1470–1495) who became a convert to the Syrian Orthodox Church and professed her faith.[13]

Our main source of information about the conversion of a great number of Maronites, including the Muqaddam Abd al-Munʿim, is the *Zajaliyya* of al-Qilaʿi and the historical account of al-Duwayhi, who follows in al-Qilaʿi's footsteps. It should be remembered that while these events took place in the second half of the fifteenth century, the Maronites were still a small group confined mainly to the northern part of Lebanon.[14] The majority of the Christians in Lebanon belonged to the Syrian Orthodox or to the Rum (Byzantine) Orthodox churches. While Lammens states only that "Jacobites" lived some place in Lebanon, al-Duwayhi relates that a great number of these Syrian "Jacobites" lived in Lebanon, spreading their "errors" among the Maronites.[15] Many of these Orthodox Syrians were originally native Lebanese, but others had emigrated to Lebanon from Syria and had been in that country for generations. Al-Duwayhi writes that the reason the Maronites turned "Jacobites" (Syrian Orthodox) is because the rituals of the Maronite and the Syrian churches were identical and that they could not differentiate between them.[16]

People of Syrian Orthodox faith became influential in many villages in north Lebanon through the efforts of their bishops and priests.[17] Prominent among these bishops were Severus Isa, bishop of Hardin (1443–1480), and Dioscorus Isa Daww (1454–1477), who converted many people of the village of Baqufa to the faith of the Syrian Orthodox Church. Daww was a native of Lebanon and had under his jurisdiction both the dioceses of Tripoli in Lebanon and Jerusalem. According to al-Duwayhi, the inhabitants of the lower district of Baqufa became "Jacobites" through the efforts of their Bishop Dioscorus Isa Daww. This so incensed the people of Ihden that they attacked the converts and destroyed their homes; they also destroyed the Ghuba Monastery, the seat of their maphrian.[18] This indicates that the Syrian Orthodox were so numerous in the northern part of Lebanon that they had their own churches and maphrian.

From al-Duwayhi's narrative based on the *Zajaliyya* of al-Qilaʿi, we learn how the Muqaddam Abd al-Munʿim of Bsharri and a great number of Maronites in north Lebanon were converted to the Syrian Orthodox Church.[19] He states that young Abd al-Munʿim appreciated learning. One day a group of "Jacobite" monks, probably from Syria, visited his uncle, the Muqaddam Rizq Allah (d. 1472), and they had with them a

book written in Garshuni (Arabic written in Syriac script) containing the doctrine of the Syrian Church. Abd al-Munʿim asked them to teach him this book and to analyze for him the doctrine it contained. After learning about this doctrine Abd al-Munʿim appreciated it and was converted to the faith of the Syrian Orthodox Church. When he succeeded his uncle as muqaddam in 1472, a Syrian merchant, Musa Ibn Atsha, established a relationship with him. When Abd al-Munʿim was to be married, Ibn Atsha sent some priests to take him wedding presents. Abd al-Munʿim liked the priests and asked them to stay with him; he built a church named after the Syrian saint Barsauma near his home. In the meantime, Nuh of Baqufa, a priest who was a Maronite convert to the Syrian Orthodox Church, returned from Jerusalem to live in the Faradis near the village of Ban in North Lebanon.[20] In Ban he began to preach *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos,* the doctrine of the Syrian Church.[21] He won many converts like Isa and Ibn Shaʿban, whom al-Qilaʿi mentions in his *Zajaliyya.* Some of these converts were monks and priests ordained by Nuh's teacher in Jerusalem, Bishop Dioscorus Isa Daww.[23] Like the rest of the Syrian Orthodox these converts learned to sign the cross with one finger to indicate the oneness of the natures of Christ after their union, and they professed only the first three Councils of Nicea, Constantinople, and Ephesus.[24] Many other monks from the Syrian Monastery of Mar Yaʿqub (St. Jacob) in the village of Ihden, began to spread the doctrine of the one nature, which al-Duwayhi calls a "heresy."[25] The number of Maronite converts to the Syrian Church must have increased so much that it alarmed Maronite Patriarch Butrus al-Hadathi, known as Ibn Hassan. The patriarch sent priests to these converts to admonish them to return to their church, but they refused, since they enjoyed the protection and support of the Muqaddam Abd al-Munʿim. The schism reached its zenith in 1487–1488, when there were two factions in north Lebanon, one Maronite and the other Syrian Orthodox. The friction between the two groups intensified and a showdown became imminent. The Maronite bishop of Ihden and his people warned the Syrian Orthodox priest, Yaʿqub, his followers, and the monks who were residing at the Syrian Monastery of Mar Yaʿqub to return to the Maronite Church, but it was to no avail; on the contrary, these Syrians chose one of their priests, Ibrahim Hiblus, to be their bishop. The Maronites of Ihden, who were no match for these Syrians, asked the Muqaddam of Biskanata and his followers for help. They responded and, taking with them men from the Diniyya district, headed toward Ihden on a Sunday morning in the year 1488. When the Syrians knew that a great force was marching against Ihden they were

stricken with fear and left the village. Some of them went to Hardin, others to Kfarhura, and still others sailed for Cyprus. Al-Duwayhi states that Mount Lebanon enjoyed peace after the expulsion of these "intruders."[26] A word of caution is needed about this episode; it is derived from the narrative of al-Duwayhi which is based on the *Zajaliyya* of al-Qilaʿi. Al-Duwayhi relates this episode twice, once in his *Tarikh al-Azmina* and again in his *History of the Maronite Denomination.*[27] Both versions are very confused and very confusing to the reader unfamiliar with this period in the history of Lebanon. However, we may deduce from this episode that the strength of the Syrian Orthodox in Lebanon was not totally crushed after this incident. They were still powerful and were supported by the Muqaddam Abd al-Munʿim. This we learn from the efforts of al-Qilaʿi to attack the religious beliefs of these Syrian Orthodox people.

Al-Qilaʿi and two other Maronites who were chosen by Fra Gryphon to study in Venice returned to Lebanon in 1493 after completing their education.[28] A very zealous Franciscan Roman Catholic, al-Qilaʿi began to vehemently criticize the Syrians and their supporter, the Muqaddam Abd al-Munʿim, upon his return to Lebanon. It was in 1494 that he wrote his book *Marun al-Tubani (Blessed Marun)* and sent it to Patriarch Shimʿun (Simon) al-Hadathi, who had succeeded his uncle Butrus on his death in 1492. In this book al-Qilaʿi attempts to prove the supremacy of Rome and the correctness of its faith. He also attempts to prove that the Maronites had been adherents to the faith of Rome since the meeting of the Council of Chalcedon (451). He wrote his *Zajaliyya* during the same period, and Maronite writers have considered it a historical record of the Maronite Church and community from the seventh to the sixteenth centuries; the previously cited episode of the rise and fall of the Syrians in north Lebanon is contained in this work.[29] Maronite writers consider him their first historian and the first defender of their faith. When the Syrians lost the support of Muqaddam abd al-Munʿim, through his death in 1495, they were gradually assimilated by the Maronites; however, a number of them lived in Hardin in the Batrun district until the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the Maronite Church retained many of the doctrines of the Syrian Orthodox Church until the end of the sixteenth century which led to more papal missions being sent to investigate the true faith of the Maronite Church and community.

After the death of Fra Gryphon in 1475, we are informed by another Franciscan, Fra Suriano, that "bad customs" had spread once more among the Maronites. Suriano does not explain the nature of these "bad customs," but we may conjecture that they were related to the faith

of the Syrian Orthodox Church. He relates that because of these customs Pope Sixtus IV sent Fra Alexander d'Ariosta to the Maronites, with whom he stayed three years. Suriano states that "for this same reason Pope Leo X finally sent me in 1515 to the Maronites, accompanied by Fra Francis de Potenza, a commissary of his court."[30] This must be Suriano's second journey to Lebanon, for he had arrived in Lebanon the first time in late 1514. From this statement by Suriano we learn the Maronites must have reverted once more to their former religious beliefs and traditions, which prompted the Popes Sixtus IV and Leo X to send Franciscan monks to correct what must have been considered a religious waywardness. Like Gryphon, Suriano was well suited for this mission. He was a man of secular and religious experience. He had been a merchant in Venice before joining the Franciscan order and had traveled widely in the East, visiting Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. He also knew Greek and Arabic well and above all, he had the curiosity to know and appreciate people and books.[31]

One year before Suriano arrived in Lebanon, the newly installed Maronite Patriarch Shimʿun (Simon) al-Hadathi delegated one of his priests, Peter, to Rome with a letter from Fra Marco de Florence, the Franciscan superior in Beirut. The letter requested the pope to confirm the patriarch in his position and to send him the pallium. Pope Leo X refused to grant the patriarch's request unless he received a letter from the patriarch to him personally. Al-Duwayhi attempts to justify the patriarch for his failure to send a personal letter to the pope. He states that the patriarch had sent his priest Peter to Fra de Florence to inquire about the ship bound for Europe. When Peter arrived in Beirut, he found that the ship was ready to leave, and since there was not enough time to contact the patriarch and carry his message to the pope, Fra de Florence forced Peter to leave for Rome carrying only his letter to the pope.[32] Be that as it may, Peter arrived in Rome and delivered the letter of Fra de Florence to the pope. The pope called his counselors, as well as Peter, and inquired about the faith of the Maronites, their customs, and their patriarch. Peter was unable to convince the pope and his counselors of the rectitude of the Maronites' faith and finally departed from Rome with two letters—one for the patriarch and the other for Fra de Florence. These letters indicate that the See of Rome was not sure of the faith of the Maronites, despite the two hundred years' relationship with them, including the papal missions sent to them. In these letters the pope asks both the patriarch and the Franciscan superior in Beirut to inform him about the faith of the Maronite denomination, its religious traditions, prayers, the manner of consecrating the holy chrism, the procedures of

electing a new patriarch, and whether the Maronites possessed letters sent by previous popes. According to al-Duwayhi, Suriano carried the pope's letter to the patriarch who was residing at the Monastery of Qanubin, accompanied by a person to translate it from Latin into Arabic. After hearing the contents of the letter, the patriarch sent a reply in March 1514, citing ten points in answer to the pope's inquiry. He stressed his obedience and that of his people to the See of Rome. To this letter he attached six more letters from previous popes to several former patriarchs. All were delivered by the priest Peter. Suriano also wrote to the pope supporting the patriarch's letter. The pope wrote again to the patriarch, praising his faith and the faith of the Maronite Church, which of all the churches of the East "God had chosen to worship him with faith" and that God intended her "to be protected in the midst of infidelity and heresy as the roses are protected among the thorns."[34] Despite this praise, the pope was still not sure of the steadfastness of the Maronites faith, for he enumerates many doctrinal points, of which the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son is one, and asks them to profess and adhere to this.[35]

Pope Leo X was not wrong in doubting the true faith of the Maronites. But he was incorrect in describing them as "roses among thorns" and living in the midst of "infidelity and heresy." In the sixteenth century Maronite rituals, liturgical books, saints, and doctrines were still those of the Syrian Orthodox Church, as shall be explained shortly. Furthermore, perhaps through ignorance of the history and religious tradition of the Eastern churches, including the Maronite Church, the Church of Rome had maintained only a flimsy and superficial relationship with the Maronite Church and community since the thirteenth century. The point is that if successive popes were completely sure of the true faith of the Maronite Church and the attitude of its patriarchs towards the See of Rome, then why did all these missions and investigations take place? And why do so many popes, since Innocent III, insist that the Maronites profess the faith and doctrines of the Church of Rome? The answer is simply that until the end of the sixteenth century the Maronites had not yet become "the most ultramontane people on earth."[36] As we proceed further in our study of the relations between the Maronite Church and the Church of Rome we will find Rome still sending missions to the Maronites to investigate their "true faith" and to examine their religious books, the only reliable source to determine the veracity of that faith. Shortly after the beginning of the second half of the sixteenth century the Church of Rome was motivated to conduct such an investigation on the occasion of the election of Mikha'il al-Ruzzi

(1567–1581) to the patriarchal office in 1567. No sooner had he been consecrated than the Maronite community in Cyprus submitted a petition to Pope Pius V (1566–1572) accusing al-Ruzzi of being of "Jacobite" (Syrian Orthodox) origin and persuasion.[37] The pope and his counselors were disturbed by this news and asked Cardinal Caraffa, who was in charge of Maronite affairs, to investigate this matter. On June 8, 1569, the pope wrote to Superior Francis in Jerusalem to proceed to Lebanon and make a thorough investigation of the charges leveled against the patriarch and to send information to Rome about the patriarch's age, beliefs, and whether his election and consecration were done with the approval of the dignitaries of the Maronite Church and whether they were in conformity with Maronite traditions. He was also asked to thoroughly investigate the belief of the Maronites, their traditions, customs, and attitudes.[38] Francis went to Lebanon and presented the letters he had received from the pope and Cardinal Caraffa to the patriarch, who immediately read them and called a meeting toward the end of November 1569. At this meeting the patriarch showed the letters containing the charges against him by the Maronite community of Cyprus to the assembled clergy and other dignitaries. When the dignitaries read these charges they declared with one voice that their patriarch was a good and righteous man. Several bishops and Francis then wrote a report declaring that the new patriarch was of sound and true faith and that they had of their own will chosen him as their patriarch, despite the fact that he at first declined this office. The patriarch also testified in writing that "if I have violated any tradition of the Maronite patriarchal See, I will be responsible before the Almighty God and the Apostolic See."[39] The report about this meeting and the letter of the patriarch failed to reach the pope because of internal conflict between the muqaddams of Bsharri, Rizq Allah and his brother Ashina. The external situation was not better either; the Ottoman government had invaded Cyprus and was supported by Syrian armies, and Lebanon—particularly Bsharri—was affected by the state of war. Therefore, the patriarch's delegate to Rome could not leave until the year 1577.

Al-Duwayhi reports these events, giving other reasons why the Patriarch Mikha'il al-Ruzzi was accused of being of "Jacobite" origin. He states that al-Ruzzi's family lived in both the upper and the lower districts of the village of Baqufa. The members of the patriarch's family who lived in the lower district became converts to the "Jacobite" (Syrian Orthodox) Church; they were finally expelled by the Maronite inhabitants of Ihden. However, those who lived in the upper part of the village remained Maronite; they were eventually forced to leave the village for

other places, such as Kfarhura.[40] Al-Duwayhi does not tell us of which section of the family Patriarch Mikha'il al-Ruzzi was a member. If his family was still Maronite, as al-Duwayhi claims, why would the Maronites of Cyprus accuse him of being of "Jacobite" origin? He must have belonged to the section of the family which had become "Jacobite."[41] Historical fact indicates that the al-Ruzzi family was originally Syrian Orthodox, a great grand ancestor emigrated from Mesopotamia to Lebanon.[42]

By the time the situation in Lebanon and the Levant improved sufficiently to allow the Patriarch Mikha'il to communicate with Rome, Pope Pius V had died and had been succeeded by Pope Gregory XIII (1573–1585). The patriarch delegated to the pope one of his bishops, Yusuf, and the Chorepiscopus Clement of Ihden. He provided them with letters from him and other Maronite dignitaries containing their expression of obedience and submission to the See of Rome. The two delegates departed from Lebanon on April 10, 1577. When the pope received these letters he sent an answer to the patriarch containing some instructions, the most important of which was the pope's order that the Maronites desist from using the Trisagion hymn with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us.*[43] The pope tells al-Ruzzi that he has learned that some teachings have found their way into the patriarch's church and strongly admonishes him to follow in the footsteps of his predecessors and renounce any teaching alien to the traditions of the Church of Rome. Most particularly, the pope protests in their celebration of the Holy Eucharist the Maronites' addition to the Trisagion of what he calls "phrases far from the truth and the faith held by the Church of Rome." These phrases are *"Thou who wast born for us and who wast crucified for us,"* or *"who wast resurrected and ascended into heaven, have mercy on us."* The pope writes that these phrases should not be addressed to the whole Trinity. They constitute a "heresy" similar to the "heresy" of Peter Fuller of Antioch condemned by the Fifth Council (meaning the phrase, *Thou who wast crucified for us,* thought to be added by Peter the Fuller to the Trisagion). Since neither the Trinity nor the Father nor the Holy Ghost was crucified, the pope emphatically orders the Maronites to drop these additions to the Trisagion from their prayers and rituals.[44] Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud may be correct in stating that since that time the Maronites dropped these additions to the Trisagion from their prayers, particularly the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us,* but their ritual books were still filled with them.[45] Enough has been said about the Trisagion and how the Maronite Church used it in the same formula as did the Syrian Orthodox Church. It is important to remem-

ber that even after 1577 the Maronite Church was still chanting this hymn in the form the Church of Rome emphatically considered heretical. Maronite ritual books were replete with doctrines and names of saints of the Syrian Orthodox Church, which were labeled by the Church of Rome as "heretical"; yet form the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries we find only one Pope, Gregory XIII, who expressly forbids the Maronites to use the Trisagion in its "heretical" formula. We shall soon see that if one depends solely on doctrines contained in their books, the Maronites were Syrian Orthodox, "Jacobites."

23

The Mission of Giovanni Battista Eliano to the Maronites

WHEN the two Maronite patriarchal delegates departed from Rome the pope sent Jesuit Fathers Giovanni Battista Eliano and Thomas Raggio with them to examine the faith of the Maronites, their religious books, priesthood offices and their manner of worship. Of these two, Eliano was most suited for this mission. Al-Duwayhi praises him for his good character, wisdom, knowledge of the natural and divine sciences, and most of all for his knowledge of Latin, Greek, Arabic, and his ability to read Garshuni (Arabic written in Syriac script).[1] A convert from Judaism to Catholicism, Eliano joined the Company of Jesus in 1552. About this time the popes were seriously thinking of bringing the Christian churches of the East under their submission. For this reason the highly qualified Eliano was delegated to the Coptic Church of Egypt in 1561–1562, but his mission failed.[2] Taking the opportunity of the departure of the delegates of the Maronite patriarch, Pope Gregory XIII entrusted Eliano and Raggio with a new mission to the Maronites. He also instructed them to establish relationships with Syrian Patriarch of Antioch Dawud Shah (1576–1591) in order to bring him and his community under the submission of Rome.[3] This was Eliano's first mission to the Maronites.

Pope Gregory XIII sent a letter with Eliano to the Maronite patriarch dated December 12, 1577. Cardinal Caraffa also wrote a letter to the patriarch dated March 3, 1578.[4] In June 1578, Eliano, his compan-

ion, and the Maronite delegates arrived in Tripoli, and after a rest the company proceeded to the Monastery of Qanubin to meet with the patriarch. The patriarch invited his bishops and Maronite dignitaries to a meeting at the monastery. At this meeting the patriarch declared that he was a Maronite, and the son of a Maronite, and that he obeyed the Roman pontiff and his rules. He gave an oath that he accepted everything that the Church of Rome accepts and rejected everything that it rejects. Then he wrote down his testimony and folding the paper said, "This is my profession for which I live and for which I die." After the patriarch declared once more his obedience to the pope, Eliano delivered the letters of the pope and of Cardinal Caraffa to the patriarch, as well as the church vestments the pope had sent with him as a gift to the patriarch. In July 1578, the patriarch wrote a letter to the pope thanking him for his gifts and graciousness. Both Eliano and the Maronite bishop wrote to Cardinal Caraffa informing him of the meeting at Qanubin.[5] When the meeting was over Eliano requested the patriarch to allow him to tour the Maronite districts to examine the books of the Maronites and their religious traditions. The patriarch gave his permission, and Eliano began by examining the Syriac and Garshuni manuscripts in the library of the Monastery of Qanubin. Whenever he found a manuscript containing doctrines contrary to the teaching of the Church of Rome he put it aside and submitted it to the patriarch and his bishops. The majority of these manuscripts contained the dogma of the *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* and *one will,* as well as the *procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone,* in accordance with the belief of the Syrian Orthodox Church. Since these manuscripts were mostly the writings of the fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Eliano brought to the attention of the patriarch and his bishops the fact that they contained many teachings contrary to those approved by the Church of Rome. The patriarch and his bishops agreed with Eliano that the manuscripts contained "impious doctrines," but they attributed them unconvincingly to "heretical Jacobite" copyists or to ignorant Maronite copyists.[6] This, of course, was not the case because the patriarch and his bishops knew that they could not justify their true belief to the papal delegate. We shall soon see what the destiny of these books was.

Eliano spent one year visiting the Maronite districts and examining Maronite religious books and religious practices. To facilitate his mission the patriarch provided him with a private letter addressed to his bishops, abbots, and clergy. He even appointed his brother, Bishop Sarkis and a priest, Jirjis Yunan, to accompany Eliano on his tour. According to al-Duwayhi, Eliano carried three notebooks with him. In one he recorded

the "errors" he discovered in the Maronite ritual books, in the second he put down the points on which he was to consult with the pope, and in the third he wrote down the rules which both the clergy and lay people were expected to observe.[7] The Maronites were expecting the assembling of a general church council at Easter of 1579, when Eliano was abruptly summoned by his superiors to return to Rome. On February 25, 1579, he bade farewell to the patriarch and departed for Rome. The patriarch and Bishop Sarkis, who, al-Duwayhi says, loved Eliano tremendously for his patience, zeal, and understanding, wrote to the pope and Cardinal Caraffa to send Eliano once more to them. They also sent two young men with Eliano to study in Rome.[8] Thus ends Eliano's first mission to the Maronites.

The importance of this mission is that Eliano was the first papal delegate to thoroughly and systematically examine the ritual books of the Maronites in order to determine their true belief. The task entrusted him was too great and too serious to be fulfilled in one visit to the Maronites and he had to return to Lebanon in the following year to complete his mission. Noteworthy is the fact that the great majority of the books Eliano examined during his first visit were those of the Syrian Orthodox Church. In fact, some Maronites confessed openly in the presence of Eliano that they professed the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature and One Will* in Christ, a cardinal doctrine of the Syrian Orthodox Church. In his report submitted to the pope on March 22, 1579, Eliano writes that in the yard of the Maronite patriarchal residence at Qanubin, he saw and heard a Maronite deacon openly proclaiming "we (the Maronites) believe that in Jesus Christ there was but one nature and one will," but Eliano was told that this person was an itinerant Syrian "Jacobite" deacon.[9] Eliano was not convinced of the Maronites' adherence to the faith of the Church of Rome, nor was he sure of the patriarch's total allegiance to the pope and his church; for this reason he did not confer upon the patriarch the pallium or the pope's confirmation. Although he went before the pope and praised the Maronites and their obedience to the Apostolic See of Rome, he told the Roman pontiff that many "errors" had crept into the ritual books of the Maronites because of their intermingling with the "heretics" and the lack of learned men to teach them the truth about their faith. He also submitted to the pope a written report containing his observations, informing the pope that he had recorded the "errors" he had found to be in disagreement with the teaching of the Church of Rome. He also pleaded with the pope to establish a school for young Maronite men in Rome and to make an effort to print books containing the principles of faith in the Maronites' language for

their instruction.[10] Al-Duwayhi claims that these "errors" which Eliano found in Maronite books were derived from "the books of the heretics" or from the "books corrupted by the heretics." These "errors," he states, were incorporated by Thomas the Carmelite (Thomas à Jesu) in section III of his book *De Procuranda Salute Omnium Gentium,* which he copied from Eliano.[11] Al-Duwayhi could not be more mistaken, for these same "errors" were detected and classified by another papal delegate, Jerome Dandini, in 1596 as shall be seen later.

To insure further the allegiance of the Maronites and to make another attempt to win the churches of the East to the Church of Rome, Pope Gregory XIII delegated Eliano once more to the Levant. A pious and learned priest, Father Giovanni Battista Bruno, was designated to accompany him on this trip. While still in Rome Eliano had translated the catechism written by Jesuit Peter Cassius and had it printed in Garshuni in April 1580, for the benefit of the Maronites. He also took with him other books which he had translated into Arabic, including Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ,* a Latin liturgy, and a book in refutation of the Nestorians and the "Jacobites." On his part, Cardinal Caraffa was pleading with the pope to have him confer the pallium on the Maronite patriarch. The pope, as we have indicated, was not sure of the patriarch's beliefs, and therefore would not confer the pallium. The cardinals were even more suspicious of the patriarch's beliefs when they learned, probably from Eliano, that Eliano had personally transcribed a copy of the Gospel with marginal notes in his own handwriting containing some "errors." The cardinals objected to the patriarch's confirmation by the pope. But Eliano testified to the piety and good will of the Maronite patriarch and assured the cardinals of his profession of the teachings of the Church of Rome. He also assured them of the willingness of the Maronite clergy and people to obey the rules of the Apostolic See of Rome. Still not convinced, the pope handed the pallium to Eliano, instructing him not to confer it unless the patriarch professed his obedience to the pope in Eliano's presence.[12] Eliano was also provided with specific instructions from Cardinals Caraffa and San Severino. Writing on behalf of the pope (May 7, 1580), Cardinal Caraffa instructed Eliano and his companion to examine the faith, ritual books, and traditions of the Maronite Church, and to grant the pallium to the patriarch only when they were certain of his faith and obedience to the Apostolic See.[13] In his instructions dated May 10, 1580, Cardinal San Severino shows concern not only about the Maronites but about other churches of the East. He wanted the two papal delegates to win all the Eastern denominations "back to the bosom of the Church of Rome."[14]

Eliano and his companion departed from Rome in the middle of May and arrived in Tripoli on June 29, 1580. They proceeded to Qanubin and arrived at the monastery on July 9. Because of old age the patriarch could not go out to welcome them, but he sent his brother, Bishop Sarkis, and some clergy to receive them with prayers and censers[15] as they approached the monastery. They met with the patriarch and indicated their desire for a formal meeting with him on July 21, to which he agreed. On the appointed day the papal delegates met with the patriarch, Bishop Sarkis, and Maronite clergy and dignitaries and explained to them the purpose of their mission. When they handed the patriarch the pope's bull he kissed it and placed it over his head, according to Oriental custom, as a sign of utmost respect and obedience. Eliano then displayed the pallium sent by the pope and delivered to him the gifts he and his companion carried with them, together with the catechism and other religious books. The delegates proceeded to explain the catechism to those assembled. Eliano, however, was particularly concerned about pointing out the "errors" and other teachings in Maronite ritual books which were contrary to those proclaimed by the Church of Rome. He also presented to the patriarch and his bishops a copy of the canons to be discussed in a forthcoming council. Apparently, the idea of convening a council was already in the making, for we learn that while still at sea Eliano had formulated the agenda of issues to be discussed at the council he intended to convene upon his arrival at Qanubin.[16] On August 18, 1580, the council met at Qanubin, ostensibly presided over by the patriarch, but in reality with Eliano as its president. It was attended by Maronite bishops, clergy, and other dignitaries. More than two thousand lay people traveled from neighboring villages to the monastery to celebrate the festivity of the Holy Virgin Mary, which coincided with the day the council was to meet. The aged patriarch had sufficiently recovered from an ailment to be able to celebrate the Holy Eucharist with the assistance of his bishops. At the end of the celebration Eliano proceeded toward the altar and recited the prayer of the call of the Holy Spirit. Then he delivered his sermon in Arabic, and in it he explained the purpose of his mission and expressed hope for its success. He distributed copies of the creed of the Church of Rome to the worshippers and began to read it with the clergy and the people repeating it after him. After mass was over the papal delegates, the patriarch, and the clergy met alone to deliberate the issues already delineated by Eliano; the deliberation lasted three days.[17]

The minutes of this council are of utmost importance to our thesis that the doctrine, belief, and rituals of the Maronite Church were typi-

cally those of the Syrian Orthodox Church. Indeed, every point the council attempted to refute or guard against reveals Eliano's anxiety to inform the Maronites that their beliefs and doctrines were "heretical" and should be corrected. It would be tedious to discuss each of the issues discussed by the council at Qanubin; it is sufficient to mention only those points which are identical with the cardinal beliefs and doctrines of the Syrian Orthodox Church.

The council resolved that:

1. The Nicene Creed should be revised to include the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.
2. The Maronites should profess two natures, two wills and two actions or energies in Christ.
3. They should drop the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us have mercy on us* from the Trisagion.
4. They should profess the existence of Purgatory.
5. Divorce on the grounds of adultery should be prohibited and that the Maronite Church should not bless the remarriage of spouses who have been divorced on these grounds.
6. The priest should not anoint the baptized with the Chrism, since it is the exclusive function of the bishop.
7. The Holy Communion should not be administered to youngsters before reaching the age of puberty.[18]

The patriarch was happy about the resolutions of the council and he signed them personally. On his part, Eliano distributed copies of these resolutions among the Maronites of Lebanon, Aleppo, and Damascus. The clergy and the people agreed with all the resolutions except the one concerning divorce. They explained to Eliano that it was difficult to deny the right of the innocent party to remarry if divorce granted on the ground of adultery. Eliano remained adamant on this point and told the patriarch that no man was allowed to remarry while his wife was still living, even in the case of her having committed adultery. In fact, a prominent Maronite approached Eliano and offered him money for permission to remarry because he had divorced an adulterous wife, but Eliano refused to grant it.[19]

Despite the resolutions of the Qanubin Council and his untiring efforts to teach the Maronites the faith of the Church of Rome, Eliano was still not convinced that the Qanubin Council, to use the words of Father Louis Cheikho, "was a sufficient measure to eradicate the tares from the Lord's field."[20] Cheikho comments that Eliano realized during his first mission that a great number of Maronite ritual books still contained teachings which were allegedly "interpolated by copyists of the

Jacobite heresy," contrary to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Cheikho further states that in order to terminate this "disease," meaning the "Jacobite heresy:"

> Wherever he went Father Eliano reexamined church books and pointed to the false and corrupt matters in them, alerted the clergy to them and recommended their correction. Or, he bought these books from the owners and burned them while promising the owners that he would provide them with a copy of the same after they had been revised and published in Rome.[21]

Cheikho also informs us that one of the manuscripts which Eliano examined was a copy of the *Nomocanon (Book of Directions)* by thirteenth-century Coptic writer al-Safi Ibn al-Assal; it was bound together with a copy of a book written by the Maronite Tuma, bishop of Kfartab.[22] Eliano wrote in Italian on the front page of this manuscript, "This book contains many errors and should be burned."[23] Cheikho, who relates the incident of the burning of church manuscripts by Eliano, gives the impression that it was commendable to do so, "to eradicate the tares from the Lord's field."[24]

The Qanubin Council was attended by Severus Muhanna, Syrian Orthodox bishop of Hardin (1571–1590), and a learned man from his church. The Maronite patriarch welcomed the two visitors and invited them to attend the council's sessions, for what purpose we do not know. However, he did attend the council and became engaged in a dispute with Eliano over the doctrine of the one or two natures of Christ. Eliano, if we can believe Cheikho, refuted the bishop and his companion.[25] Bishop Muhanna's attendance of the council is puzzling to us, unless he knew about Eliano's purpose in examining the Maronite books and about the accusation leveled by the Maronite patriarch and clergy that Syrian Orthodox writers had inserted their "errors" into the books and was thus motivated to meet with Eliano at the council and defend his church and writers against what he felt were false accusations.[26]

On September 28, 1581, while Eliano was in Lebanon, Patriarch Mikha'il al-Ruzzi passed away after receiving the last rite from Eliano.[27] In the presence of the two papal delegates Eliano and Bruno, the Maronite bishops elected his brother, Sarkis, to succeed him as patriarch.[28]

The first business undertaken by the new patriarch was to visit his parishes. From a letter addressed by Eliano to Cardinal Caraffa we learn that the new patriarch was the first to enforce the teachings and practices of the Church of Rome. Eliano states that the patriarch personally con-

firmed baptized children, for in the past regular priests had done this. He also forbade priests to administer the Sacraments to baptized infants and ordered them to profess publicly the doctrine of two wills and energies in Christ.[29] From Lebanon, Eliano traveled to Syria, where he tried to convert the Malkite and the Syrian Orthodox patriarch to Roman Catholicism, but he was unsuccessful. In August 1582, he went to Egypt as a papal delegate to work among the Copts, his purpose being to convert them to Roman Catholicism; he remained in Egypt until March 1585, but met with no success. He then returned to Rome where Pope Sixtus V conferred upon him the office of grand penitencier, which he retained until his death on March 3, 1589.[30]

Eliano's convictions about the beliefs of the Maronites and whether they were in conformity with the beliefs of the Church of Rome cannot be measured by his two visits to the Maronites, the letters he wrote to Rome, or his praise of the Maronites while he was their guest; they can only be judged by the information he accumulated and recorded during his visits to the Maronites. This information must have been contained in the three notebooks already mentioned by al-Duwayhi. In one of these notebooks Eliano put down the "errors" he found in the ritual and other religious books of the Maronites. This notebook was later discovered by seventeenth-century Carmelite writer Thomas à Jesu, who incorporated its contents into his book *De Procuranda Salute Omnium Gentium* (1613).[31] Al-Duwayhi read this book and decided to write a refutation of what he believed to be false accusations which it contained against his people. However, since these objections to the faith of the Maronites had been raised by Eliano more than thirty years before Thomas à Jesus published this book, al-Duwayhi determined to obtain a copy of the original notebooks of Eliano lest someone think his refutation lacked substantiation. Al-Duwayhi succeeded in obtaining a copy of the notebooks that had been transcribed by Kaspar al-Gharib (Gaspar Perigrinus), one of the two Maronite young men Eliano took with him to Rome to study after his first visit to Lebanon in 1578.[32] According to al-Duwayhi, Kaspar al-Gharib obtained the original copy of these notebooks from Eliano and copied it in his own handwriting. When he returned to Cyprus he became famous for his learning and piety. There he left the copy at the Cross Monastery, the seat of the Maronite bishopric on the island. It was from this copy that al-Duwayhi learned about the books which Eliano examined in Lebanon, his comments on them, and the "errors" he found in each of them. Eliano must have been extremely meticulous in examining these books, for he recorded the number of pages in each of them, together with the names of the owners

who made them available to him. Al-Duwayhi states that Eliano compiled his comments on the "errors" in these books in a separate notebook which Thomas à Jesus later incorporated in his *De Procuranda.* He then goes on to enumerate these books examined by Eliano.[33] Al-Duwayhi rises to the defense of his church and her faith by writing a book, still in manuscript form, entitled *al-Ihtijaj (Protest or Apology),* and in it he challenges the opinions of Eliano and Thomas à Jesu.[34] This might explain Father Cheikho's astonishment that al-Duwayhi neglected to mention in his history the Council of Qanubin (August 1580) as if it did not exist.[35] How could al-Duwayhi possibly appreciate that council when some of the issue raised in it were considered by Eliano as "errors" which contradicted the teachings of the Church of Rome? We shall see later that Maronite Patriarch Sarkis al-Ruzzi accused Eliano of falsely reporting to Rome about the faith of Maronite Church.

The "errors" which Eliano and Thomas à Jesu, who copied him, attribute to the Maronites are numerous. We may classify them under two categories: one relating to fundamental Christian doctrines, the other to ritualistic practices. There is a possible third category relating to the creation of the world, man, etc., but al-Duwayhi made a summary of these "errors," describing them as "accusations" at the end of his book, *al-Ihtijaj.*[36] The principal "errors" of doctrine which Eliano found in Maronite books are:

1. That our Lord has one person and one will,
2. That our Lord has but one nature,
3. That our Lord has but one will and one energy,
4. That there is no private Judgment,
5. That there is no original sin,
6. That there is no reward and punishment before the universal judgment,
7. That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only,
8. That Christ suffered in his divinity,
9. That there is no purgatory.

Other "errors" which Eliano ascribes to the Maronites are confirmation instituted at the time of baptism, the priest's right to institute the confirmation, the Eucharist in which both elements (the bread and wine) were administered to lay people, the Eucharist administered to infants at the time of their baptism, priests being married only to virgins, a man with physical defects being able to become a priest, a man's being able to put his wife away for adultery and to marry another woman, a person's being allowed to deny his faith publicly while hiding it secretly, the use of

leavened bread in the Sacraments because the Lord ate leavened bread at the Last Supper, the officiating clergy being allowed to celebrate the Holy Eucharist after placing a copy of the Gospel on the altar, the holy chrism being an essential part of baptism, and being able to dissolve a marriage for several reasons, particularly adultery.[37]

Al-Duwayhi refutes every one of these "accusations" in the order they were set down by Eliano and Thomas à Jesu. Concerning major doctrinal issues, al-Duwayhi has presented nothing other than what he has previously said in attempting to refute the opinions of other writers. For example, on the issue that our Lord has but one person and one will, al-Duwayhi retorts that Eliano borrowed this "accusation" from the books of the Nestorian writer, Abu al-Faraj Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib, whom we have discussed earlier. He also accuses Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, of following the opinions of Ibn al-Tayyib and spreading the doctrine of one will (Monothelitism) among the Maronites. Al-Duwayhi repeats the mistake of making Ibn al-Tayyib a Maronite and that he and Tuma of Kfartab were influenced by the writings of Saʿid Ibn Batriq.[38] On the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, al-Duwayhi retorts that this "accusation" was first launched by Cardinal Peter of Marcellus, the delegate of Pope Innocent III to the Maronites. He argues, as unconvincingly as before, that the letter of Innocent III containing this "accusation" was meant for the Malkites living in Syria, not for the Maronites; he insists, wrongly of course, that the Maronites always believed in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.[39] As to the doctrine of one nature of Christ, al-Duwayhi repeats what he has already mentioned in his *History of the Maronite Denomination,* that the Maronites were always Chalcedonians and had sacrificed 350 in defense of their belief. Furthermore, he refers to the book ascribed to John Marun, the *Exposition of the Faith,* and erroneously affirms that the author was none other than John of Serum (Sirmium), who succeeded Ephraim of Amida to the See of Antioch. It was pointed out earlier that John of Serum was neither John Marun nor the patriarch of Antioch, but the patriarch of Constantinople. Al-Duwayhi also produced a quotation from the *Exposition* confirming that John Marun and his followers did not decline to profess the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* according to Saint Cyril of Alexandria: in other words, he affirms that John Marun and the Maronites were Monophysites and consequently "heretics." This is most surprising, since al-Duwayhi's primary contention is to absolve John Marun and the Maronites from being labeled "Monophysite heretics." Even more surprising is al-Duwayhi's citing of doctor of the Syrian

Orthodox Church, Jacob of Sarug, a Monophysite who held the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos,* to prove that John Marun and his followers professed this doctrine.[40] In brief, al-Duwayhi's refutation of the "accusations" which he thought Eliano and Thomas à Jesu leveled against the Maronites totally contradicts the point he sets out to make, that the Maronites were not heretics.

Al-Duwayhi does not stop at the refutation of what he calls the "accusations" leveled by Eliano and Thomas à Jesu against the Maronites; he goes a step further by questioning their linguistic efficiency and integrity as writers, particularly Eliano. He states that Eliano's knowledge of the Arabic language and his reading of Garshuni (Arabic written in Syriac script) was inadequate to the point that he misunderstood the writers of the books he examined.[41] He argues that Arabic terms have many meanings and are incomprehensible to those for whom it is their native tongue, let alone to Eliano who had not sufficiently mingled with the Arabs, studied their books, or mastered their grammar and morphology. All that he acquired was a knowledge of the Arabic alphabet and a smattering of colloquial speech, which by no means enabled him to understand the books he examined or distinguish between those who were approved or disapproved by the Maronites. He simply copied the opinions of writers, apparently without discrimination. In brief, al-Duwayhi accuses Eliano of being an "illiterate," unable to understand the Arabic language or native traditions.[42] Finally, he accuses Eliano of having reported nothing but falsehoods about the Maronites and other Eastern people.[43] We are not in a position to challenge Eliano's efficiency in the Arabic language, but al-Duwayhi himself had formerly acknowledged and praised Eliano's knowledge of the language and his ability to read Garshuni.[44] The main point here is whether the doctrines Eliano found in Maronite books were in conformity with those maintained by the Church of Rome. They were not. When Eliano visited Lebanon, the ritual books of the Maronites contained enough doctrines to betray their Monophysite or "Jacobite" origin.

In conclusion, Eliano's mission to the Maronites and the doctrinal "errors" he found in their books yielded two results: through his efforts a Maronite school was established in Rome in 1584 for the religious education of Maronite students and the printing of Maronite books after they had been revised.[45] One of the early books, published in 1594 after Eliano's death, was the book of liturgies previously mentioned. It contains many liturgies written by the fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church, but these liturgies were omitted from the edition of the book in 1608.

24

The Mission of Jerome Dandini to the Maronites

THE EFFORTS exerted by Eliano to weed out "heretical" teachings from Maronite ritual books do not seem to have convinced the Apostolic See of Rome that the Maronite faith and religious literature had, at long last, been purified, for we find yet another Pope, Clement VIII (1592–1605), delegating Jerome Dandini (1554–1634), professor of philosophy at Peruge, to the Maronites to carry out the same mission Eliano had undertaken before him. Fortunately, Dandini left us a lengthy account of his mission to the Maronites with a vivid description of his voyage and the manner and customs of the Maronites and of the Muslims (whom he generally calls Turks).[1]

From Dandini's account we learn that the Maronites in his time and indeed for a long time past had been misrepresented to the pope and cardinals by being accused of "diverse errors and considerable heresies."[2] Maronite students studying in Rome at that time must have exerted a considerable effort to explain and substantiate the origin of their church and faith to Latin writers and dignitaries of the Church of Rome. Eliano's report to the pope and his account of the "errors" he had found in their books probably aggravated this controversy and increased suspicion about the "Catholicism" of the Maronites. For this and other reasons, particularly the justification of the tremendous expenditures on the Maronite school in Rome, the pope found it necessary to send Dandini

to Lebanon in order to procure a faithful report of the beliefs of the Maronites and their allegiance to the Apostolic See of Rome.[3]

Dandini arrived in Tripoli at the end of August 1596, accompanied by Father Fabio Bruno. Leaving Father Bruno behind when he fell ill, Dandini proceeded to the Monastery of Qanubin, arriving on September 1. On the next day he had an audience with Patriarch Sarkis al-Ruzzi (1581–1596), who had succeeded his brother Mikha'il in 1581. Dandini explained to the patriarch the nature of his mission and handed him the pope's brief; the patriarch devoutly kissed the brief and placed it on his head as a sign of respect. This visit to the patriarch was brief, but on the following day he had another audience with the patriarch. However, as soon as Dandini began to discuss his mission, the patriarch complained that the pope had sent only an ordinary letter, not a formal papal bull confirming the belief of the Maronites and their reunion with the See of Rome, as had been the custom of previous popes. The patriarch thought that such a solemn bull would have been a great consolation to his bishops and people. He also complained that a year earlier he had sent a delegate to the pope to express in his name, and in the name of the Maronites, their submission to him and his church, and entreated him to confirm him in his "ancient office as the Patriarch of Antioch" but had received no response from the pope.[4] Dandini, who had no knowledge about these matters, was greatly astonished but tried his best to appease the patriarch, who seems to have been satisfied with Dandini's apology. In the meantime, Dandini proposed to the patriarch the convocation of a council to determine the true state of the Maronites' beliefs, adding that it would be sufficient for this purpose to call only bishops to this council. The patriarch vehemently opposed such a council for reasons connected with the previous council at Qanubin, held by Eliano in 1580 in the time of the patriarch's brother, Mikha'il, and attended by the patriarch himself, then only a bishop. He protested that when that council met, he and other bishops attending were handed only a blank sheet of paper to sign, with the assurance that it would be filled only with what was good and profitable for the Maronite people. After the bishops signed the papers, those who had asked them to sign took the papers to Tripoli and completed them inserting a great number of "errors and considerable heresies." Without informing any member of the council or leaving a copy behind, they proceeded to Rome and most maliciously defamed the members of the council before the pope and his cardinals. Fearing that such abuses might recur, the patriarch apologized but remained vehemently opposed to the convocation of a council.[5] Dandini

could not believe what he heard from the patriarch, but he relates that since many persons confirmed the patriarch's complaints, he was not in a position to deny them. However, he made efforts to appease the patriarch while promising to examine the minutes of the Council Qanubin he was complaining against. He also promised that he would, however, do nothing without the patriarch's participation and consent. The patriarch presented yet another pretext for not having a council: since a state of war existed between the Ottoman Turks and Europe, it would be difficult to assemble Maronite dignitaries and have them meet with the delegate of the pope. On this point Dandini was able to pacify the patriarch by convincing him that some pretexts or pretenses could be found to justify the assembly of the council. Finally, Dandini relates that this "good old man" consented to his request and wrote his bishops inviting them to a council.[6]

There is no evidence that Eliano deceived the patriarch and the other bishops into signing a blank paper at Qanubin in 1580. There is no evidence, too, that Eliano filled this paper with "errors and heresies" and carried it to Rome to malign the beliefs of the Maronites before the pope. Most surprising is the patriarch's allegation that Eliano carried out this malicious scheme without the knowledge of the council or anyone else. Consequently, the patriarch must have insinuated that because Eliano had maliciously defamed the Maronites the pope found it necessary to send Dandini to investigate the state of their true beliefs. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud doubts the sincerity of the patriarch's charges against Eliano.[7] In fact, what makes these charges more untenable are several letters the patriarch wrote to Eliano in Rome, praising his commendable efforts to assist the Maronites. The patriarch must have forgotten that his brother, Patriarch Mikha'il, had sent a letter to the Jesuit general informing him that "Eliano had read our books and found many errors in them," and requesting him to send Eliano once again to Lebanon.[8] However, regardless of the patriarch's complaint that he and other bishops were made to sign a blank paper, it appears that the information provided by Eliano to high dignitaries in Rome indicates that Maronite books still contained doctrines contrary to those maintained by the Church of Rome, hence Dandini's mission.

Dandini made extensive investigation of Maronite beliefs before he convened a church council. He states that he found much evidence of "abuses" in the Maronites' beliefs which made him open his eyes and apply himself with great industry to discover the truth in the matter.[9] He was motivated by two reasons: the importance of the matters he was investigating, and that he learned some years ago that these and other

"errors" were attributed to the Maronites.[10] These "abuses" and "errors" were still maintained by the Maronites and were surely recited by their clergy until the end of the sixteenth century. Dandini sets nine categories of these "errors."

1. That there was in Jesus Christ but one nature, the divine.
2. That the Holy Ghost proceeds only from the Father.
3. That all the Trinity was incarnate, died on the cross, and rose again.
4. That an husband might put away his wife, and take another, if she committed adultery, or for other reasons.
5. That there is no original sin.
6. That the souls that departed from their bodies saw not heaven to be rewarded, nor hell to be then punished, but that they waited for that till the universal judgment: and that, in the meantime, they remained in a place where there was neither grief nor joy.
7. That it is lawful to deny one's belief outwardly, and also by words, provided it be treasured up in the heart.
8. That the sacrament of confirmation was not distinct from baptism.
9. That they gave the Eucharist to young children.[11]

Dandini states that he exerted every effort to be informed of these "errors" and even employed others to help him in searching for them. Yet he was able to find only two of them were still practiced by the Maronites: divorcing a wife on grounds of adultery and administering the Eucharist to children. As for the other "errors," he understood very well that the Maronites had been falsely charged with them. He admits, however, that while reading one of their books—he could not remember its name—he found in it the belief in one will and one operation in Christ (Monothelitism). He also found in it "some other impure things" and decided to put all these "abuses" into writing and to propose each of them separately to the council when it met to undertake the task of correcting them.[12]

The first thing to note about the list of "abuses" or "errors" compiled by Dandini is that it is almost identical with the one compiled by Eliano some twenty years earlier, but there is not evidence that Dandini had studied Eliano's notebooks before he departed from Rome. It is most unlikely that, even if he had studied them, he would mention it. Furthermore, we have no evidence that Dandini had the knowledge of Oriental languages necessary to read Maronite books. As he states, he must have had to rely on others to read these books for him in which he found

"some errors."[13] It was exactly this list of "errors" that Dandini submitted to the forthcoming council for deliberation.

After having acquainted himself with the beliefs of the Maronites and the "errors" still contained in their books, Dandini notified the patriarch, bishops, and other clergy and deacons of his intention to convene a council. This notification, sent not by the patriarch but Dandini, indicates that the authority of the papal delegate was above that of the patriarch. The council finally met on December 28, 1596. The letter of the pope to the patriarch explaining Dandini's mission was read and Dandini added his reasons for convening this council. He also delivered a short speech, particularly addressed to the bishops, reminding them of their duty toward the church.[14]

Dandini divided the issues to be discussed into three categories: the first was related to their belief; the second and third were related to the Maronite school in Rome and the treatment and future of its graduates. Dandini relates that as he was ready to open the council, he was interrupted by the patriarch, who voiced great displeasure with the former council which met at the monastery sixteen years earlier. He protested that neither he nor his predecessor had approved of the decisions of that council and he went on to condemn the "errors" which he claimed were imposed upon them and his people. He also condemned those who held that council and assured Dandini that he and his people had always followed and would continue to follow the teachings of the Church of Rome.[15] A deacon present at the council was moved by the patriarch's anathemas and shouted, "Yes, we will follow the teachings of the Church of Rome and will in no way separate ourselves from it, whatever misery may befall us."[16] Dandini appreciated this enthusiasm and considered it a good sign at the beginning of the council; despite this, Dandini wanted to be more certain about the Maronites' belief, the very object he had been charged to examine. He set before the members of the council each of the "errors" he had already classified and asked every one of them to declare his belief. Having done this, Dandini affirms that all of them with one accord and without dispute professed the following articles:

1. That there is in Jesus Christ but one person which is divine, with two natures, two wills, and two operations; one of which is divine, the other human.
2. That the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, as from the only principles.
3. That the Son alone was incarnated, and not the whole Trinity; as also who was born, died, who rose again, and who ascended into heaven. For that reason, they took the word Trisagion

two manner of ways, applying it sometimes to the whole Trinity, sometimes to the Second Person only, but when they took it for the first, they added it not at all; but when for the second, they added it—by coherence to the incarnation, birth, death, and other the like things, which truly agreed with Jesus Christ.

4. That it might be judged by their actions, that they acknowledged a place of purgatory, and original sin; that the first was sufficiently set forth by their alms and prayers.
5. That the second proved itself plainly by the baptism they gave to little infants, to the end, that being washed and cleaned of their sins, they might obtain eternal life although they had committed no actual sin that required their being washed and cleansed by that Sacrament knowing that Saint Augustine made frequent use of that argument, to prove that same truth against the Pelagians of his time.
6. That souls, generally speaking, when they depart from the body, go straight to heaven to enjoy blessedness, or to hell, to be there eternally punished, or for a time to purgatory.
7. That it is never lawful to deny one's faith in words, as Jesus Christ himself manifestly declared, "He that denies me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."
8. Finally, that in marriage they permitted sometimes a separation of living, but that nothing but death was able to dissolve the bonds of matrimony, in such a manner, as that it was lawful for the husband to espouse another, comformable to those words of Jesus Christ, which are so expressed, "Whoever puts away his wife and marries another commits adultery."[17]

After they testified to each one of the above articles, Dandini laid before the members of the council the book in which he found some "errors." They denied these as their own books, claiming that they had been "maliciously contrived by the Jacobites, and dispersed among their nation." They also told Dandini that the rest of their books were quite different, and that the pope had received false information about the Maronites. Dandini seems to have been satisfied by their answers and states that "I saw nothing in their books which they acknowledged for truth, but what was Catholic."[18]

Dandini contradicts himself by stating that he saw nothing but "what was Catholic" in Maronite books; he stated earlier that he found in one of these books doctrine of one will and one operation in Christ together with "some other impure things."[19] Certainly, the doctrine of one will (Monothelitism) is not considered by Dandini's church as

"Catholic," but heresy. Furthermore, these "impure things" or "abuses" were neither "Catholic" nor in conformity with the teachings of the Church of Rome. It is then surprising that Dandini states with certainty that he saw nothing in Maronite books but what was "Catholic" when he had already made a list of nine articles of abuses to present to the council for correction.[20] More surprising is his show of satisfaction after hearing the patriarch slander the council convened by Eliano in 1580 and anathematize those who held or attended it. It is true that the Patriarch Sarkis al-Ruzzi does not mention Eliano by name, but al-Duwayhi does. Al-Duwayhi even brands Eliano a liar. He states that on September 18, 1596, after Dandini's arrival, Patriarch al-Ruzzi called the chief priests, Maronite dignitaries, and learned men to a meeting. After the letter of the pope to the patriarch was read, the patriarch proved before these people and the papal delegates (Dandini and Bruno) that his brother, Patriarch Mikha'il, and the Maronite denomination were innocent of the accusations "falsely leveled against them by Giovanni Battista (Eliano)."[21] Since Dandini by his own admission found these "errors" in the Maronite books, it is surprising to see him believe the claims of the members of the council that these books have been "maliciously contrived by the 'Jacobites'."[22] What these men did not tell Dandini is how and when these "Jacobites" distorted the books. This accusation was hinted at for the first time by Patriarch Mikha'il in one of his letters to Cardinal Caraffa but was stated explicitly at the council assembled in 1596. Maronite writers, except for Assemani, have persistently repeated this accusation against the Syrian Orthodox Church. The books the Maronites presented to Dandini for examination, and in which he saw nothing but what was "Catholic," must have been new books transcribed in the sixteenth century and naturally contained teachings in conformity with those of the Church of Rome; the Maronite books with which the Church of Rome and its delegates were most concerned were the ancient Maronite books. These books, particularly those ascribed to John Marun, contained a palpable profession of the doctrine of one will (Monothelitism). We have no evidence that the "Jacobites" distorted Maronite books or that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, perpetrated the same distortion. Nor does historical fact support the claim that the "Jacobites" went to live in the Faradis Valley in Lebanon, where, under the pretense of piety, they transcribed and distorted Maronite books.[23]

There is little doubt that the members of the Qanubin Council of 1596 had told Dandini the truth about their faith as contained in their books. They must have shown him some of their newly revised books, not the ancient ones. They must have also led him to believe that the

pope had received false information from Eliano about their faith.[24] The truth is that this Council of Qanubin was identical with the one assembled by Eliano in 1580, and the doctrinal issues discussed by both councils were the same. In this regard, Dandini's mission and the council he convened to examine the "errors" in Maronite were an extension of Eliano's mission and council.

If we examine the list of "errors" Dandini found in Maronite books, we find that, except for the denial of the original sin and that a person may renounce his faith openly while treasuring it in his heart, all the rest constitute fundamental doctrines of the Syrian Orthodox Church. However, because of his ignorance of the doctrines of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Dandini misunderstood its most fundamental doctrines, that is, the one nature and the Trinity. He states that one of the "errors" he found in Maronite books was the belief that there was but one nature in Christ, the divine;[25] yet this is not what the Syrian Orthodox Church maintains. The Syrian Orthodox Church, following Saint Cyril of Alexandria, believes that at the Incarnation the two natures of Christ have been united with each other in an ineffable manner and have become one, but without losing their properties, hence Saint Cyril's phrase *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos.* Consequently, separating these natures after their union and considering them as distinct from each other is a return to the theological views of the School of Antioch, "Nestorianism," which maintains that the Son who was born of the Father before all the world is other than the one who was born by the Holy Virgin Mary. This meant that the Holy Virgin did not bear God but a mere man. Obviously, Dandini, like other ancient and contemporary Chalcedonian writers, has confused this orthodox doctrine of the Syrian Church with that of the heretics Apollinaris and Eutyches, who maintain that the outcome of the union of the natures of Christ was one divine nature.[26]

Dandini is even more confused on the Trisagion. From the seventh century until Dandini began to examine Maronite books, the Maronites had chanted the hymn of the Trisagion as it was sung in the Syrian Orthodox Church with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us have mercy on us.* We have already discussed the Trisagion including this phrase thoroughly and pointed out that it was used by the church since the fourth century.[27] We have also demonstrated its orthodoxy and that Patriarch of Antioch Peter the Fuller was falsely accused of adding the cited phrase to the Trisagion to corroborate his "Monophysitic" belief. The Chalcedonian churches, including the Church of Rome, have condemned this phrase in the Fifth Council and in the councils that fol-

lowed. The Chalcedonians erroneously maintain that this phrase is addressed to the whole Trinity, with the result that all the Trinity was incarnated, died on the cross, and rose again. This is how Dandini, a Chalcedonian by tradition, came to misunderstand the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* in connection with the Trinity. Like the Syrian Orthodox Church, the Maronite Church, both before and after it became a separate entity, continued to chant the Trisagion with this phrase, not with the intention of addressing it to the whole Trinity but to the second person of the Trinity (Christ) alone. Therefore, it is futile to maintain, as Dandini did, that all the Trinity was incarnated, crucified, and resurrected.[28] This misinterpretation of the Trisagion does great violence to the manner in which many church fathers have understood the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* in the Trisagion. It is also in this connotation that Ephraim of Amida, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, understood this same phrase.[29] That these doctrines are found in ancient Maronite books is evidenced by the books attributed to John Marun, as well as by the book, *al-Huda (Nomocanon).* We have already provided a thorough discussion of the doctrines of the one will, one nature, the Trisagion, and the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, and need not repeat them here. Dandini's list also contains other beliefs and traditions maintained by the Syrian Orthodox Church. Of these we may mention the dissolution of marriage on the grounds of adultery, the denial of the existence of purgatory, neither reward nor punishment before the universal judgment, the Sacrament of confirmation not being distinct from baptism, and the administration of the Eucharist to young children.[30] We may then safely conclude that the doctrines contained in these books reveal that the Maronites were Syrian Orthodox who believed in the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* before they became a distinct community.

Some conclusions may be reached from the accounts of the missions of Eliano and Dandini to the Maronites. The great number of the books these two papal delegates examined were of Syrian Orthodox origin. This indicates not only the dearth of religious literature in the Maronite Church but also its total dependence on the writings of the Syrian fathers. It also indicates that until the sixteenth century the Maronite Church did not separate clearly and decisively from the mother Syrian Orthodox Church in its beliefs, rituals, and traditions. It is true that as a result of the coercion and persecution of the Maronite monks by emperor Heraclius in the seventh century these monks and the Maronite Church and community that followed accepted the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon, as well as the doctrine of one will

promoted by Heraclius. Yet the doctrine of *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* (Monophysitism) was never officially repudiated by the Maronite Church. This doctrine survived in Maronite ritual books until the very end of the sixteenth century, when at long last the Maronites became the ultramontane community in the Middle East.

One point should be made regarding the right of the Maronite patriarch to use the title of "Patriarch of Antioch." Maronite Patriarch Bulus Masʿad emphatically states that "the patriarch of the Maronite denomination is the only true patriarch of Antioch."[31] This claim is historically and traditionally unfounded. We have demonstrated earlier that in canonical terms the Maronite patriarchate has no foundation. It was only in the thirteenth century that some Maronite patriarchs began to add the title "Patriarch of Antioch" to their name. Indeed, it is only recently that they began to add to their given names that of "Butrus—Peter" to show that they were the custodians of the See of Antioch, an office established according to tradition by the Apostle Peter. The fact that the See of Rome did not consider the Maronite patriarch as the lawful patriarch of Antioch is substantiated by the letter of Pope Innocent III, in which he subjects the patriarch to the authority of the Latin patriarch. In this letter Innocent empowers Maronite Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti and his successors to wear the pallium with which the "Latin Patriarch of Antioch" will gladly invest him: "We herewith grant to you and to your successors by our Apostolic authority the full right of the Pallium as proposed by the normal procedure of the patriarchal office, which right the Patriarch of Antioch [the Latin Patriarch of Antioch], should have freely granted to you in accordance with approved custom, which we believe that your predecessors in the Church of Antioch rightfully enjoied."[32]

The pope must have subjected the Maronite patriarch to the authority of the Latin "Patriarch of Antioch" because he recognized the latter as the "only Patriarch of Antioch," otherwise he would have had two patriarchs under his authority claiming the same title. Although the instructions of Innocent III authorize the Latin patriarch to invest the Maronite patriarch with the pallium, Maronite Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs erroneously insists that the pope sent the pallium to al-Amshiti directly, not through the Latin patriarch.[33] In fact, there is evidence that Pope Innocent III held the catholicos of the Armenian Church in a higher position than that of the Maronite patriarch, for he personally sent him a pallium with his delegate, Cardinal Peter of Saint Marcellus. In his speech at the meetings of the cardinals on September 23, 1750, Pope Benedict XIV mentioned some cases in which former popes had con-

ferred the pallium on some heads of the churches of the East. Of these was the pallium Innocent III sent with his delegates, Cardinal Soffred (or Geoffrey) and Peter of Saint Marcellus, to John VII, catholicos of Armenia in 1203.[34] It is evident that, unlike the Armenian catholicos, the Maronite patriarch was invested with the papal pallium by the Latin "patriarch of Antioch." However, the popes were not uniform in addressing the Maronite patriarch by the title "Patriarch of Antioch." While Alexander IV called Maronite Shimʿun (Simon) II the "Patriarch of Antioch,"[35] the Apostolic See of Rome simply referred to him as Maronite patriarch.[36] Whatever the case may be, the title "Patriarch of Antioch" used by Maronite patriarchs is arbitrary and not sanctioned by ecclesiastical canon or tradition. According to Lequien, the Maronite patriarch is not counted among the true patriarchs of the See of Antioch, and the title "Patriarch of Antioch," which Maronite patriarchs have been adding to their names for generations, is only an honorary title.[37] In light of the above, the statement of the members of the Lebanese Council (1736) affirming that, since the separation of the Maronites from other Eastern denominations, their patriarch was always called "the Patriarch of Antioch" is historically groundless.[38] Equally groundless is the claim of the members of this council that the Roman pontiffs never objected to the title "Patriarch of Antioch" used by Maronite patriarchs, but in fact always called them "Patriarchs of Antioch."[39]

25

The Latinization of the Maronite Church

IN THE LATTER PART of the sixteenth century the missions of papal legates Eliano and Dandini were instrumental in achieving at long last the complete Latinization of the Maronite Church. Attempts to do this began under Pope Innocent III in the early part of the thirteenth century and were continued by succeeding popes, but only touched external practices such as wearing of Latin vestments by the Maronite clergy and the wearing of a ring and mitre by Maronite prelates; the discipline of the Maronite Church was seldom affected. However, at the First Council of Qanubin convened by Eliano in 1580 and more specifically at the Second Council of Qanubin assembled by Dandini, systematic Latinization affected the discipline of the Maronite Church. According to Maronite Bishop Pierre Dib, "the work of Eliano and Dandini marked the point of departure of a systematic Latinization, touching the very substance of cult."[1] One manifestation of this Latinization process was the adoption of the romanized missal in 1592. Bishop Dib reports that although modifications were introduced before the sixteenth century (for example, the traditional form of baptism was substituted by the Latin form of baptism), yet he seems to believe that such modification "had rather a very restrained application."[2] It is reasonably certain that by the end of the sixteenth century the Maronite Church had become the ultramontane church in the Middle East in dogma, discipline, and submission to the See of Rome.

The Latinization of the Maronite Church was abetted by Yusuf al-Ruzzi (. 1608), who was elected patriarch while Dandini was still in Lebanon. According to Dib, al-Ruzzi was "an inconsiderate Latinizer who sacrificed a great number of venerable practices to copy better the usages of Rome."[3] The practices which Dib did not specify are permitting bishops to eat meat but lay people to eat fish and drink wine during Lent. The patriarch abolished the week-long observation of the fasting of Nineveh during which Maronites offered continuous prayers for the repentance of sins. Finally, the patriarch shortened the periods preceding the festival of the Apostles as well as Christmas during which the Maronite people were not allowed to eat meat.[4] Al-Ruzzi convened a council at Dayʿat Musa (Musa's village) in 1598 which not only confirmed the Latin practices proposed by the Council of Qanubin held by Dandini but also added six more canons, including the substitution of the Gregorian calendar for the Eastern one—another step toward the Latinization of the Maronite Church.[5] The adoption of the Gregorian calendar by the patriarch and the council at Dayʿat Musa provoked protest from the Rum (Byzantine) Orthodox patriarch, who, in a petition submitted to the governor of Damascus, complained that "by adopting the Gregorian calendar, the Maronite denomination has created great confusion among the rest of the Christian denominations concerning the computation of years and church festivals."[6] The governor responded by arresting the Maronite priests and dignitaries in Damascus, who were released only through tremendous effort of the Maronite patriarch.

The Latinization of the Maronite Church continued under Patriarch Jirjis Amira (d. 1644). Amira was one of the first graduates of the Maronite School in Rome and was a devout Roman Catholic. He was so devoted to the Roman Catholic cause that clergymen of other Eastern churches called him a "Roman bishop."[7] Being such an ardent Roman Catholic, Amira was greatly preoccupied with furthering the cause and with realizing the aspirations of the See of Rome among the Maronites. His Latinization policy enraged the more conservative bishops who then turned against him.[8]

Under Patriarch Yuhanna (John) al-Safrawi (d. 1656) the Maronites in Lebanon were placed under the protection of France in 1649, thanks to successful mission of Archbishop Ishaq al-Shidrawi who was delegated by the patriarch to the French government.[9] Now the Maronites could enjoy the protection of the French King Louis XIV against the molestation of the Ottoman government and its pestiferous agents. Through the efforts of Patriarch al-Safrawi, a French vice consulate was established in Beirut, and the first official was a zealous Roman Catholic

Maronite, Abu Nawfal al-Khazin.[10] The establishment of this consulate indirectly led to the development of strong relations between the Shihabi amirs (princes) of Lebanon and the Maronites, and by 1770 the Shihabis embraced Christianity and joined the Maronite Church.[11]

Among the Maronite patriarchs who were unhappy about the Latinization policy of Rome, especially Maronite rite, was Istefan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704). Al-Duwayhi is said to have suffered a great deal from the maneuvers of Latin missionaries in the East who were violating the ancient practices of the Maronite Church and substituting the Eastern Maronite rite with Latin rite.[12] This does not mean, however, that the Latinization of the Maronite Church or that the authority of Rome over this Church was diminished. As a devout Roman Catholic and a graduate of the Maronite school in Rome, al-Duwayhi never wavered in his allegiance to the authority of the See of Rome, or in his defense of the Roman Catholic faith. He only desired that the Eastern, that is, Syriac rite, be left intact in its primitive form.[13]

The adherence of the Maronite Church to the authority of Rome, especially in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, made it suspect in the eye of the Ottoman government and its agents. Other Christian denominations became also suspect because of the Maronites' association with Rome which made these denominations detest the Maronites. The antagonism between the non-Catholic Christians of the East and the Maronites intensified to such an extent that al-Duwayhi could write to Pope Innocent IX that the Maronites "are hated even more because of you."[14]

Al-Duwayhi cherished France's protection of the Maronites and counted on the power and prestige the French ambassador enjoyed at the Sublime Porte. In 1700 al-Duwayhi appealed to the French government to prevail on the Ottoman sultan to remove the injustices inflicted on the Christians of Lebanon. The French government responded, and its ambassador to the Sublime Porte intervened on behalf of the Christians of Lebanon, reminding the Ottoman government that France's protection of the Maronites would always be enforced and respected.[15]

Al-Duwayhi further used France's protection of the Maronites to save his own patriarchal office from subjugation by the authority of the Ottoman sultan. From the time of the Ottoman occupation of Syria in 1516, the patriarchs of the different Christian denominations had obtained firmans (royal decrees) from the Ottoman sultan confirming them in their office. Such power of investiture was legally important since without it a patriarch was not considered the legitimate head of his denomination or his church. The Maronite patriarchs, however, had not

requested such firmans from the Ottoman sultans; they acted on the premise that the Maronites' patriarchs and the Maronite people were under the protection of France and therefore needed no confirmation by the sultan in their office. The question of obtaining such firmans by the Maronite patriarchs was raised in the time of al-Duwayhi. The patriarch of the Syrian Orthodox Church complained to the Sublime Porte that the Maronite patriarch was like other heads of churches in the East, an Ottoman subject and should obtain a firman for his investiture. In response the Ottoman government asked al-Duwayhi to apply officially for a firman for his investiture, but al-Duwayhi evoked the special privileges his denomination had obtained through the protection of France and thus the Ottoman government was confronted with a delicate political and diplomatic issue with France. Consequently, al-Duwayhi was able to maintain the independence of the Maronite patriarchs from the direct authority of the Ottoman sultan.[16] Despite this effort to preserve the Syriac Eastern rite, however, this well-meaning patriarch could not forestall the Latinization of the Maronite Church.

Al-Duwayhi stands out as one of the most prominent Maronite patriarchs because of his religious and historical writings and most particularly for his defense of the Maronite Church and its faith. But when his historical opinions relating to the origin and faith of his church are put to objective examination they betray lack of historical foundation or substantiation. Had he been able to free his church from the grip of the Latin missionaries, al-Duwayhi might have succeeded in preserving the Syriac language, traditions, and rites of the Maronite Church which were identical to those of the Syrian Orthodox Church. Unfortunately, the Latin missionaries enjoyed great power over the Maronite Church and were determined to expand and perpetuate its Latinization, just as they had attempted with other Uniate churches such as the Chaldean Church in Iraq—only to provoke the vehement opposition of the Chaldean clergy.[17]

Further Latinization of the Maronite Church was carried out by the Lebanese Council assembled at the Monastery of Louisa in Lebanon in 1736. The meeting of this council is possibly the most important event in the history of the Maronite Church since there is no evidence that the church had ever witnessed a council of like importance and magnitude. Both Maronite clergy and laity wanted the council because they felt it urgent to remedy some of the abuses within their church, including "the finding of inconsiderate and badly misunderstood Latinization and lack of ecclesiastical organization."[18] The Maronite clergy and prominent laymen appealed to Pope Clement XII to send Joseph Assemani as his legate

to convene a council. The pope responded affirmatively and delegated Assemani to Lebanon to preside over the forthcoming council. Carrying with him instructions from the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, Assemani arrived in Beirut on June 17, 1736. On July 1, he went to the Monastery of Qanubin where he met with the Patriarch Yusuf Dirgham al-Khazin (d. 1742), and read to him and the clergy in his presence the instructions of the pope and the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.[19] On September 30, the council convoked by Assemani met at the Monastery of Louisa and continued for three days. When Assemani laid before the council the reforms he had been working on since he left Rome, there was strong opposition from the patriarch and some of the clergy, especially Elias Muhasib, bishop of Arqa. There was also a great deal of intrigue among the clergy against Assemani's mission which, in the words of Maronite Bishop Pierre Dib, "was only brought to an end through the intelligence and patience of the papal legate, the good sense of the patriarch, the prudent intervention of the two Consuls of France, M. Martin and Sheikh Nawfal al-Khazin, and the discreet activity of the Jesuits and Franciscans."[20]

The Lebanese Council of 1736 is of great importance to the present study because it is the only major Maronite council in modern times to elaborate rules and canons for the Maronite Church. Even more significant for our study, it was the first Maronite council to institute the Latinization of the Maronite Church by confirming the Latin rite and practices introduced by Pope Innocent III in the early part of the thirteenth century. In fact, in one of its sessions the council cited the letter of Pope Innocent III to Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti and declared it the duty of all the Maronites to obey everything that letter contained, particularly the Latin practices proposed by the Pope.[21] Following are some of the Latin usages instituted by the council:

1. Baptism should be performed not by immersion according to the custom of the Eastern churches, but by only pouring water over the head of the baptized according to the Latin custom.[22]
2. Contrary to the ancient Eastern custom, a confined woman who has given birth to a child is allowed to attend church before forty days have lapsed since the date of her delivery.[23]
3. Baptism and confirmation should be performed separately and confirmation is the exclusive right of the bishops.
4. The bishops should attempt to dispense with the indulgences offered by the Apostolic See of Rome.[24]
5. Unleavened bread should be used in the eucharistic service, according to the custom of the Church of Rome and in con-

formity with the bull of Pope Paul V, dated August 20, 1566.[25]

6. The priest should not cover his head (that is, wear the cap usually worn by the officiating priest according to the custom of Eastern churches) while celebrating the Mass.[26]

It should be remembered that the customs which the members of the council referred to as the customs of the Eastern church are mainly the customs of the Syrian Orthodox Church.

In addition the Lebanese Council established the supremacy of the Pope over the Maronite Council and hierarchy. The council subjugated the Maronite patriarch to papal authority to the point that a Maronite patriarch became no more than a "Roman bishop." We shall see later that some Maronite patriarchs became cardinals in the Church of Rome, thus accepting a governmental office in the Church of Rome, which is lower than the rank of patriarch let alone the "Patriarch of Antioch" which Maronite patriarchs claim for themselves.

According to the custom of the Eastern churches and particularly of the Syrian Orthodox Church, a large cross is carried before the patriarch in church celebrations. The Lebanese Council decreed that if the Maronite patriarchs were in Rome no cross should be carried before him because of the presence of the pope or papal legate.[27] The council also decreed that:

1. According to church protocol the Maronite patriarch should occupy the seat behind that of the pope.
2. The Maronite patriarch has no right to dismiss bishops from their offices because this right is exclusive to the pope.
3. The name of the Maronite patriarch should be proclaimed in the Mass and other obligatory prayers after the name of the pope.
4. The Maronite patriarch cannot dispose of important ecclesiastical and disciplinary matters without first consulting the pope.[28]

Then follows a statement by the Maronite metropolitans and bishops pledging their full allegiance and submission to the absolute authority of the pope first and to their patriarch second. The metropolitans and bishops also pledged that in the mass they would first proclaim the name of the pope and then the name of their patriarch. They stated further that as they are not permitted to do anything without first consulting their patriarch, so the patriarch is not permitted to act in matters concerning the faith or the discipline of the clergy (such as the dismissal of bishops

from their offices) without first consulting with the pope.[29] Thus the total submission of the Maronite Church and hierarchy to the See of Rome was made canonical by the Lebanese Council.

Other proposals made by Assemani for reform were presented to the Lebanese Council but were met with vehement opposition. Controversy arose over the practice of mixed monasteries where monks and nuns lived together separated only by a cloister, although both shared the same goods and submitted to the same authority.[30] The patriarch, his clergy, and some Latin clergy voiced their opposition to mixed monasteries. Assemani welcomed the idea of separate monasteries for both monks and nuns and began to make arrangements for certain monasteries to be exclusively for men or for women.[31] However, he encountered vehement opposition from Bishop Elias Muhasib of Arqa, who wished to maintain the ancient custom of mixed monasteries. Bishop Pierre Dib states that Bishop Muhasib was able to convince the patriarch to change his position and advocate mixed Monasteries.[32] In the meantime Rev. Elias Sa'd (the patriarch's secretary) with some members of the patriarch's own family and a certain Latin missionary, supported the patriarch's opinion of maintaining mixed monasteries. The rift between the patriarch and Assemani widened so deeply that at one point the patriarch declared that he no longer recognized Assemani as the papal legate or that Assemani had authority over the Maronites. Even the legitimacy of Assemani's mission to the Maronites was challenged.[33] Meanwhile, instructions arrived from Rome insisting that the separation of monasteries for monks and nuns should be enforced. But Assemani was unable to carry out the instructions from Rome and left Lebanon in 1738. After a short visit to the Maronites of Cyprus, Assemani arrived in Rome and submitted his report on the Lebanese Council to Pope Clement XII and the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. In response, the pope appointed a commission of cardinals to study the acts of the Lebanese Council, particularly the issue of mixed monasteries. The Reverend Elias Sa'd went to Rome as representative of the opposition party to complain against the Lebanese Council and against Assemani. The pope died on February 6, 1740, without resolving the problem. His successor, Pope Benedict XIV, called a meeting on August 7, 1741, and in his presence the commission of cardinals discussed the problem. After protracted deliberation a solution was reached. The Lebanese Council was declared legitimate and the custom of mixed monasteries was sustained.[34] On September 1, 1741, Pope Benedict XIV approved the acts of the Lebanese Council.[35] The practice of mixed monasteries continued and was later prohibited by the

Council of the Monastery of Louisa in 1818.[36] However, it was not completely discarded until the time of the Patriarch Yusuf Hubaysh (1823–1845).[37]

From the time of the meeting of the Lebanese Council in 1736 the Maronite patriarchs have completely abdicated their authority to the pope. In recent times, some Maronite patriarchs (such as Bulus al-Maʿushi (d. 1975)) have accepted the office of cardinal, a position lower in rank than that of patriarch, and in ecclesiastical and church disciplinary matters, the Roman pontiff has become supreme. To be sure, Maronite church councils were convoked, but Rome decided their outcome and approved their acts. When the Council of Bkerki met in 1856 in the time of Maronite Patriarch Bulus Masʿad (d. 1890), it was convoked not by the patriarch but by Pope Pius IX and presided over by papal legate Msgr. Brunoni.[38] Indeed, the authority of Rome became greater when it began to interfere in the elections of the Maronite patriarchs—as in the case of Patriarch Simʿan (Simon) Awwad (d. 1756), who was chosen a patriarch by Pope Benedict XIV,[39] and Patriarch Bulus al-Maʿushi, who was chosen a patriarch by Pope Pius XII.[40]

The Latinization policy of Rome had detrimental effects on the Maronite Church. Some of these effects may have indirectly contributed to the dilemma the Maronites are now facing in Lebanon. No matter how noble the Latin missionaries felt their aims in the Middle East, particularly their attempt to confirm the Maronites in the Catholic faith and have them adopt Latin church customs, they were probably unaware that their endeavors to Latinize the Maronite Church were destroying the Syriac rite and tradition and the Syriac language. These, however amorphous, were the only vestige of the once glorious past of the Syrian Church of Antioch of which the Maronite Church was a component. The Syriac rituals of the Syrian Church of Antioch not only have their beauty and historicity deeply rooted in apostolic tradition, they also stand as the "national" symbol and pride of the Syrian people whose language was pre-eminent in their country (Greater Syria) before its occupation by the Arabs in the seventh century. It is true that the Arabization of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch, especially in Syria, began with the Arab occupation of that country, but to this day the Syrian Church of Antioch has tenaciously adhered to its Syriac rite and liturgy. It was able to withstand the impact of the Arabic onslaught and has thus preserved its rituals, despite the fact that the majority of its communicants, especially in Syria and Iraq, do not understand the Syriac language. The Syrian Church was able to preserve its rituals and traditions in their primitive state simply because it did not come under

Latin influence like the Maronite Church. On the contrary, the Maronite Church was influenced by both Arabization and Latinization, with the baneful result that the Maronite Church at present suffers a deplorable loss of identity. One can hardly blame the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch for Arabizing portions of its Syriac service because its communicants are scattered all over the Middle East and cannot claim a country or a piece of land of their own. Even those Syriac speaking people of Tur Abdin or the inhabitants of the Syriac speaking villages of northern Iraq are too weak to maintain their language due to the vehement impact of the Arabic language and cultures on their way of life. The situation of the Maronites is different. Fortified for many generations in their Mountain of Lebanon, the Maronites could claim more independence in their ecclesiastical affairs and therefore were and still are in a much more favorable position to revive their Syriac tradition and language. But instead of encouraging the Maronites to retain and cherish their Syriac heritage and revive the Syriac language in order to become once more the lingua franca of the Maronite people, the Latin missionaries discouraged the use of this language and denigrated the Syriac heritage and added more woe to the state of the already Arabized Maronites by Latinizing their church. The Maronites thus almost completely lost their national Syriac identity. Since the sixteenth century, instead of taking pride in their Syriac legacy, the Maronites, in their desperation to find a legitimate origin of their church and people, have claimed that they were the descendants of the Marada (Mardaites), which is historically groundless. Like the Nestorians, the Rum (Byzantine) Orthodox, and the Syrian Orthodox People, the Maronites are of Syriac-Aramaic origin. We should duly admit that the Lebanese Council of 1736 emphasized the use of the Syriac language first and Arabic second in Maronite church services. But this emphasis was not intended nor did it contribute to the revival of the Syriac language as the national symbol of the church.[41] If efforts had been made to revive the Syriac language and traditions, the Maronites today would not be suffering from a loss of identity, sometimes claiming to be of Mardaite origin and sometimes of Arab origin. The least one can say with certainty is that the names of the villages and towns of Lebanon stand as eternal testimony to the Syriac-Aramaic origin of that country. Indeed, until the eighteenth century the inhabitants of many villages in Lebanon, especially Bsharri and three neighboring villages, used the Syriac language as their lingua franca.[42]

Latinization also affected the Maronite liturgy which is the center of Maronite religious worship. The Maronite liturgy is essentially the Syriac version of the liturgy of Saint James, the Apostle, and this is the

liturgy of the Church of Antioch. We have shown throughout this study that the Maronites had no liturgies of their own and that the liturgies they used belong to the Syrian Orthodox Church. The Reverend Seely Joseph Beggiani is correct when he states that "the Maronites did not compose a new liturgy but adopted and adapted the liturgies already in use by the Christians of their area."[43] The liturgy called Sharar, which Maronites claim to be their "authentic" liturgy, is not Maronite; it is the liturgy of Saints Addai and Mari used by the Eastern section of the Syrian Church of Antioch in present-day Iraq. This church embraced the teaching of Nestorius in the second half of the fifth century and since then has been known as the "Nestorian" Church. The liturgy of Addai and Mari predated the formulation of the Maronite community in the seventh century and the Maronite Church and patriarchate in the following century. the liturgy of Sharar is most likely a Maronite plagiarism of the liturgy of Addai and Mari, as a close comparison between the two reveals.[44] So far no Maronite writer, not even Rev. Beggiani, the latest to write about Maronite liturgy, has produced convincing evidence that Sharar is a Maronite liturgy.[45]

The liturgy of Saint James used by the Maronite Church has become Latinized. According to *The Maronite Rite: A Catechism,* "many factors, such as the Crusaders, the Roman delegates and the Roman Seminary in Rome, contributed to the Latinization of the Maronite liturgy."[46] As noted above, this Latinization was not in the best interest of the Maronite Church. Only recently has the Church of Rome begun to appreciate the quality and worth of the Eastern rite. In 1935, Pope Pius XI appealed to Catholic schools and seminaries to observe an Annual Eastern Rite Day.[47] This does not mean that Rome was advocating a de-Latinization of the Maronite liturgy, it only means that Rome had realized that the Eastern rite is not inferior to the Latin rite. Another recognition of the Eastern rite was given by Pope Pius XII in 1957. The first canon of the Law on Persons approved by this pope affirmed that the "Eastern Rites, whose venerable antiquity is an illustrious ornament to the entire Church as well as an affirmation of the divine unity of the Catholic faith shall religiously be preserved."[48] Perhaps this new approach of the Church of Rome toward the Eastern rites led Maronite Patriarch Bulus al-Maʿushi and the patriarchal council he convened to restore the traditional customs of performing confirmation simultaneously with baptism according to the ancient custom of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch (this had been altered at the Second Council of Qanubin convened by Jerome Dandini in 1596).[49]

The Second Vatican Council (1963–1965), with its emphasis on ecumenism and its better understanding of the Eastern churches, decreed that the Eastern rites should be held in high esteem because of their venerable antiquity.[50] This is, to be sure, an entirely different spirit and approach from the one that prevailed at Qanubin in 1596 toward perpetuating the Latinization of the Maronite Church. With the Second Vatican Council the Church of Rome had come a long way in its relations with the Eastern churches, but there is still much to be done to achieve greater ecumenism between those churches and the Church of Rome. Taking advantage of this ecumenical regeneration, the Maronite Church "recognized the need for retaining traditional concepts."[51] This means that the Maronite Church intended to discard, gradually perhaps, the Latin usages which have been forced upon her and to restore the ancient traditions of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch.

In response to the appeal of the Second Vatican Council to revitalize the spirit of the Catholic Church, the Maronite Church in the United States took the initiative to introduce some liturgical reforms. Their implementation was begun in 1973 by the Maronite Bishop Francis Zayek, head of the Maronite Diocese of Saint Marun in America.[52] An important reason for these reforms was that the Maronite liturgy "was highly Latinized and somewhat static."[53] Some Maronite clergymen in the United States are of the opinion that because of a lack of uniform English translation their liturgy has become "repetitive and impoverished."[54]

By implementing the liturgical renewal, Bishop Zayek restored some of the ancient traditions of the Maronite Church for which Latin traditions have been long substituted. Baptism and confirmation are now performed simultaneously, Syriac vestments of the clergy were recommended for the celebration of the holy Eucharist, and Latin traditions were removed from the Maronite liturgy.[55] In 1969 the first reform missal was published with several revisions. A group of *Husoyos* (propitiatory prayers) were also translated into English for use by the English-speaking Maronites.

In 1972 the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Churches proposed reform of the Maronite liturgy.[56] A revised form of the Maronite liturgy was proposed which Bishop Zayek adopted for use by his diocese in the United States. Major changes were also made in the revised liturgy, especially the removal from it of all Latinization vestiges so as to restore the "authentic spirit of the ancient liturgy."[57]

Thus, at long last, the Maronite Church has begun to realize and

appreciate the importance of the Syriac tradition to its "national" existence. Both the Arabization and Latinization of the Maronite Church have been detrimental to the true Syriac-Aramaic identity of the Maronites. If the Latin missionaries had encouraged the Maronites to revive and revitalize their Syriac language and Syriac rite with the intent of rendering Syriac once more the lingua franca of the Maronite Church and its communicants, the Maronites in modern times would not have had to attempt to identify themselves with the Mardaites or with the Arabs, a course which finally led to their becoming greatly weakened by a predominant Arab ambience. The Maronites have all the necessary resources to revive once more the noble Syriac language and Syriac traditions which are the pride of the Syrian Church of Antioch.

26

The Maronites in Modern Times

From the previous chapters we have learned that the Maronites emerged for the first time as a community in the eighth century. In the following century, they became one of the established sects living mostly in the mountains of Lebanon. The majority of the people of Lebanon, including the Maronites, were Syrian Aramaeans, whose language and church rites were Syriac. However, in the eighth century, under the Umayyads and the Abbasids, who attempted to occupy Lebanon, but could not because of the mountainous terrain, Islam found its way into Lebanon. Since the eleventh century, the Druze added another element to the demographic structure of Lebanon. And when we come to the present time, we find a multiplicity of religions and sects in Lebanon, not always living in peace and harmony. The recent Islamic upheaval in Iran added another dimension to an already complex religious posture in Lebanon. Ayatullah Khomeini is using the Shiite community of Lebanon to establish a Shiite hegemony in that country by violence and use of arms, if necessary. Where do the Maronites stand on the present political and sectarian chaos in Lebanon?

Although the Maronites emerged as a religious community in the eighth century, we do not hear about them as a people who played any role in the political affairs of the Middle East until the time of the Crusades.

After their occupation of Antioch, the Crusaders, in their drive toward Jerusalem, were assisted greatly by the Maronites, who welcomed them at Easter, on April 10, 1099,[1] This contact with the Crusaders is very significant because it obviously raised the hopes of the Maronites that, for the first time, they could rely on a Christian ally against the Muslims. It must also have awakened a nascent feeling in the Maronites that they were an exclusive community, in fact, the only ancient community whose destiny is tied to Lebanon. Thus, to Butrus Daww, Lebanon became synonymous with the "Maronite Nation" and an extension of this "nation."[2] It is also for this communal consciousness that, as Christians, the Maronites began to establish relations with the Roman Catholic Church. The first serious contact with Rome was the visit of Maronite Patriarch Irmia al-Amshiti to Rome in 1215. But the relations of the Maronite Church with Rome were precarious and did not settle until 1596 at the Council of Qanubin convened by Jerome Dandini. It was only then that the Maronite Church and community finally adopted the Roman Catholic faith and came directly under the authority of the Vatican.[3] Prior to the thirteenth century, information about the lives and activities of the Maronite patriarch is very scanty and somewhat obscure. But the visit of Irmia to Rome was perhaps the end of Maronite isolation, and the Maronite Church and community received their greatest strength from the different missions which the Church of Rome delegated to the Maronites. In fact, in the thirteenth century the Europeans were still invading one part of the East and placing great hopes on their friends, the Maronites, to reestablish their position in the country of al-Sham (Syria).

By the sixteenth century, the Maronite patriarchs were in contact with Tuscany, Spain, and France to protect their interests at home, and by the seventeenth century, the relations of the Maronites with France culminated in the placing of the Maronites under French protection.[4] In 1516, the Ottoman Sultan Selim I conquered Syria and Egypt, and the Maronites, who lived mostly in Jibbat Bsharri, al-Batrun, Jubayl, and Munaytira, became part of the newly formed Vilayat (governorship) of Tripoli, which was placed under the authority of the governor of Damascus.

Detesting the tyranny of these rulers and the heavy taxes imposed on the Maronites, the Maronite Patriarch Musa al-Akari (d. 1567), in a letter dated March 25, 1527, appealed to the Emperor Charles V to save Lebanon from the Ottomans. He promised the emperor that he would place at his disposal fifty thousand well-trained fighting men. In 1550,

through the efforts of the patriarch, Sultan Sulayman, the Magnificent (1520–1566) issued a royal decree to the governor of Tripoli to protect the rights of the Maronite patriarch and his community. This decree was in fact a recognition of the autonomy of the Maronite community in its internal affairs.[5]

Also, in the time of this patriarch, the Maronites began to move from Tripoli to Kisrawan, Matn, al-Gharb, and al-Shuf in the southern part of the mountains of Lebanon. The Maronites were efficient farmers, and the Druze landlords employed them in farming their land. Joined in a common interest, the Maronites and the Druze determined to protect their interests and combat the corruption of the Ottoman governors.[6]

The Maronite community enjoyed an enviable position under al-Amir (Prince) Fakhr al-Din II, al-Maʿni (1590–1634). Al-Maʿni was a Druze who succeeded his father, Qurqumaz, in the leadership of the Druze in al-Shuf in 1584. By 1591 he had extended his domain to include Matn, Beirut in 1598, and finally, Kisrawan in 1605, which was inhabited predominantly by the Maronites. He also acquired Tyre and a large part of Palestine. Many of the Druze factions were antagonistic to al-Maʿni with the exception of Shaykh Yazbak Ibn Abd al-Afif, who leaned heavily toward the Maronites.[7] The Maronite Patriarch Yuhanna Makhluf (d. 1633) delegated Bishop Jirjis Amira (later himself a patriarch) to Rome and Tuscany to seek an alliance with Ferdinand, grand duke of Tuscany, against the Ottoman government. In fact, Bishop Amira visited Europe twice, and through the Maronite students at the Maronite School in Rome he made many contacts with Europeans. He also encouraged the Europeans and their religious missionaries to come to Lebanon.[8] Al-Maʿni enlisted many Maronites for his army which formed a substantial source of power for that army. He also used the Maronites as his advisors. One of his principal advisors was the Maronite patriarch himself.[9]

Encouraged by the pro-Christian policy of al-Maʿni, many Maronites moved south to al-Shuf and the Bika Valley and established themselves as active and efficient farmers. Soon Maronites became engaged in the silk industry which was introduced into Lebanon by al-Maʿni. Both Maronite farmers and businessmen became the economic backbone of the Maʿni's principality. As a result, the demographic situation of these two areas changed, and the towns of Dayr al Qamar and Zahla were founded by Maronites in the midst of a Druze community. In the north, Kisrawan, Jubayl, and al-Batrun had already become predominantly

Maronite, and by the end of the eighteenth century, when the Maronites expelled the Shiite Hamadis, rulers of those areas, these areas became wholly Maronite.[10]

In the light of what has already been said, we may safely conclude that the period of Fakhr al-Din II, al-Maʿni, marks the rise of the Maronite community to an unprecedented eminence. It is true that the prince had associated himself with so many religious sects that the people could not determine whether he was a Druze or Sunnite. Yet, his pro-Maronite policy strengthened the Maronite Church and community and encouraged the Maronites to migrate to the south where they gained more wealth and power.[11] It is more probable that the growing consciousness of the Maronites as a cohesive sect with distinctive socio-political and religious characteristics contributed to their concept that Lebanon was any extension of the Maronite identity. This is evidenced by the caption on the imaginary picture of Yuhanna (John) Marun which reads, "The glory of Lebanon is given to him."[12]

The Maronite community continued to gain power and prestige in the seventeenth century, especially under al-Amir Milhim (d. 1568), nephew of al-Amir Fakhr al-Din. The new amir had trouble with the Ottoman sultan who refused to recognize him as successor of Fakhr al-Din. Milhim appealed to the Maronite Patriarch Jirjis Amira (d. 1644) to request that the pope mediate with the Ottoman sultan to recognize Milhim as the ruler of Lebanon. The patriarch wrote an appeal to the pope in which he stated that Milhim was one of the Maʿni princes in whose time the Christians gained great freedom. He requested that the pope prevail on the king of France to convince his ally, the Ottoman sultan to recognize Milhim as the ruler of Lebanon. The patriarch was successful in his plea to the pope, and Milhim was installed in his position.[13] He also reinstated the members of the Maronites of the Khazin family, especially Abu Nadir and appointed him the governor of Kisrawan. The Hubayshis were also reinstated in Ghazir. After his death in 1647, Abu Nadir was succeeded by his son, Abu Nawfal al-Khazin.

After regaining their positions in Kisrawan, the Maronites began to buy farm land from the Shiites. Meantime, a great number of Maronites moved from their homes in the north and in the Druze area to Kisrawan, causing friction between them and the Shiites who feared the rivalry of the newcomers. Despite the friction, the Maronites continued to emigrate to Kisrawan, which except for a few villages, came under their complete control in the eighteenth century.

The Maronite migration to the Druze region of the south was so great that the Maronites soon outnumbered the Druze. They were wel-

comed by the Amir Ahmad (d. 1679), the last of the Maʿni princes who had succeeded his father in 1658.[14] Through the Maronites, Dayr al-Qamar became a thriving emporium of silk which was exported to Beirut, Sidon, and other Mediterranean ports. The tolerance toward and protection of the Maronites by Amir Ahmad was so exemplary that in 1683 the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi (d. 1704) sought asylum with Ahmad at Dayr al-Qamar from the tyranny of the Shiite Hamadis in Jibbat Bsharri in north Lebanon.[15]

We have also seen earlier that the Maronite community had been placed under the protection of France and that the French kings began to choose their consuls from among the Maronite dignitaries.[16] Through the power and prestige of France the consuls then exercised authority over the Maronite Church and its clergy. The Maronites were so proud to be under the protection of France that some Maronites called themselves, "the French of the East."[17] Thus, through France, the Shihabi amirs, who will be discussed shortly, realized the importance of Maronite rule and power, and they and the Maronites became united in a common interest.

In 1697, Amir Ahmad died without an heir, and the Druze notables chose his nephew Bashir al-Shihabi as their new ruler. He was succeeded in 1707 by the young Amir Haydar al-Shihabi, grandson of Amir Ahmad al-Maʿni. Haydar recognized the authority of the Maronite al-Khazins and the Hubayshis of Kisrawan and Ghazir and treated these two families as equal to the feudalistic Druze families. The Druze dignitaries supported Haydar but opposed his son, Milhim, who succeeded him in 1732. They thought of him as no more than a representative of the Ottoman sultan in levying taxes and, therefore, could be replaced. Under pressure from the Druze, Amir Milhim abdicated in 1754 in favor of his two brothers, Mansur and Assaf, and moved to Beirut, where he was greatly honored by the Maronites until his death in 1761.

The year 1754 was a turning point in the history of the Shihabis when the Amir Ali al-Shihabi became converted to Christianity and joined the Maronite Church. He was followed by the majority of the Shihabis and their relatives, the Druze Lamʿi princes who joined the Maronite Church.[18] Thus, by the second half of the eighteenth century, the Shihabi principality became Maronite. The conversion of the Shihabis to Maronite Christianity does not mean that they antagonized the Muslims or the Druze; their conversion deepened the rivalry and conflict among the prominent feudalistic families.[19]

Under the Shihabis who had been converted to Christianity, the Maronites, of all other Christian denominations, enjoyed a unique posi-

tion in the Ottoman empire. They were under the direct protection of France, and their patriarch did not have to receive an investiture in his office from the Ottoman sultan. In fact, since the middle of the eighteenth century, the Shihabi amirs chose a Maronite for the office of a mudabbir (administrator and chief counselor). The first to occupy this position was Sa'd al-Khuri (d. 1780). The mudabbir grew in power and prestige to the extent that one Mudabbir Jirjis Baz could act without consulting with the amir or obtaining his approval, which aroused the indignation of the Amir Bashir against Jirjis and his brother, Abd al-Ahad. Finally in 1807, Bashir had the two brothers killed.[20]

It is very significant to note that the latent "Maronite ideology" of the past century intensified from the eighteenth century onward. The Shihabi administration became synonymous with "Maronitism." Maronites began to consider Lebanon as their homeland much to the consternation of the other groups, especially the Druze whom they considered as strangers.[21]

Some Maronites considered themselves as an exclusive community within the Shihabi principality and Amir Yusuf al-Shihabi, who converted to Christianity, as "the first Shihabi ruler of the Maronites."[22] Other Maronites, such as Bishop Niqula Murad (d. 1862), maintained that the Maronites were the majority in Lebanon and that the Shihabi principality was essentially Christian. Murad thought of the Druze as rebels against the "legitimate Maronite authority."[23] Thus the Maronites came to believe that they were a separate group from the rest of the people of Lebanon, be they Christian, Druze, or Muslim. Their church had become the institution reflecting the Maronite ethos and their patriarchate a symbol of both religious and secular authority.

Conflict developed between the Maronites and the Druze, especially when Amir Bashir II, al-Shihabi assumed power in 1788 after the death of Amir Yusuf. Bashir II took advantage of the preoccupation of the Ottoman government with expelling the French who had occupied Egypt under Napoleon in 1798, to become more independent of Ottoman authority. The Maronites supported Bashir II, who was a converted Maronite, as their own prince.

The Druze notables opposed Bashir II and collaborated with the notorious Ahmad Pasha al-Jazzar, wali (governor) of Akka, against Bashir. But when al-Jazzar died in 1804, Amir Bashir turned against the Druze notables, destroying their authority, much to the delight of the Maronites. In the meantime the Druze muqata'jis (fief holders or landlords) in the south came to believe rightly or wrongly that the Maronite muqata'jis and farmers were trying to wrest their land away from them,

increasing the Druze fear of the growing ambitions of the aggressive Maronites.

With the abdication of Amir Bashir II in 1840, the Maronites lost a staunch supporter. Bashir had collaborated with Muhammad Ali, viceroy of Egypt, in the occupation of al-Sham (greater Syria) in 1832. But the intervention of the Europeans powers forced the Egyptian troops to withdraw from Syria in 1840. Bashir was forced to abdicate and was exiled.

Amir Bashir II was succeeded by Bashir III, nicknamed Abu Tahin (d. 1860). The deposition of Bashir II created a great political vacuum since his successor lacked the necessary qualities of a strong ruler. Taking advantage of the deposition of Bashir II, the Druze in the south began to attack and massacre the Maronites a year after his abdication. The massacre continued sporadically until 1860 and Lebanon became a blood bath.[24]

As a result of the massacres, the Ottoman government sent General Mustafa Nuri Pasha to investigate the situation. He deposed Amir Bashir III and sent him to exile, and Lebanon was placed under the direct rule of the Ottoman government. The Maronites were displeased with this new arrangement, and in 1842 the whole Maronite Church and community, especially Patriarch Yusuf Hubaysh, demanded that the government be restored to the Shihabis. The Ottoman government refused on the premise that the Shihabis, especially Bashir III, favored the Maronites and antagonized the Druze. In order to solve the problem of both Christians and Druze, the Ottoman government in agreement with the European powers divided Lebanon into two districts, the northern under a Maronite and the southern under a Druze governor.

Patriarch Hubaysh protested this new arrangement to the Ottoman government on the premise that the Maronite villages and farmers in the south (the Shuf) were placed at the mercy of their Druze landlords. The Ottoman government agreed to appoint a Maronite agent to each of the villages to act with the governor in solving the problems of the Maronites.[25] Despitė this arrangement, the Maronites in the south refused to be under a Druze governor. They were instigated by the clergy who awakened in them a deep feeling of hatred toward the Druze. Both the Druze and the Maronites resorted to violence and civil war broke out in April 1845, when Maronite fighters attacked and burned a Druze village.[26] The Ottoman government favored the Druze in this conflict and partially disarmed the population. They also made some changes in the administrative system hoping to curtail the power of both landlords and tax farmers.[27]

Between 1845 and 1858, the Maronite district of north Lebanon was plagued by a conflict between the peasants and the landlords of the Khazin and Hubaysh families. Taking advantage of the weakness of the governor of the district, the landlords began to oppress the peasants, causing the peasants to overthrow the yoke of the landlords. Led by an enthusiastic young man, Yusuf Karam, and encouraged by the Maronite clergy and sympathetic new landlords, the peasants were able to establish a peasant government. They divided up the large estates and deprived the landlords of their privileges.[28] Some believe that the Patriarch Bulus Masʿad approved of the peasants' actions, but this was not the case. In fact, he preached moderation and placed himself above the conflict.[29]

The Maronite peasant revolt in the north encouraged the Maronites and other Christians in the Druze district of the south to revolt against their Druze landlords. As in the north, the Maronites in the south were instigated by the clergy. The civil war began on April 29, 1860, when Maronites attacked Druze villages and the Druze Maronite villages. Just as in the north, the conflict was between the Druze landlords and Maronite farmers. Sectarianism played a great role in this conflict, and the massacre of the Christians by the Druze was viewed by the European powers as being strictly an assault against Christians. The Ottoman governor of Sidon, Khurshid Pasha, was blamed because of his hatred toward the Christians. In fact, Patriarch Masʿad called on his people in the north in the name of religion to rush to the aid of their brethren in the south which made the warring parties believe that they were fighting a religious war.[30]

The Maronite Church, the big powers, and the Ottoman government were all to blame, however, for the Lebanese tragedy of 1860. The Maronite Church had encouraged the Christians to defy their Druze landlords. The French government supported the Maronites because they were Catholics under French protection, and the British government supported the Druze to balance France's support of the Maronites. The ordeal of 1860 ended with the establishment of a new administration of the mutasarrifiyya, a kind of compromise for all parties concerned.

According to this compromise, Lebanon was to be governed by non-Lebanese Christian mutasarrif appointed by the Sultan with the agreement of the big powers. The mutasarrif was to be assisted by an elected administrative council representing all denominations of the country. In addition, all the feudalistic privileges in the country were abolished and the country was divided into seven administrative areas ruled by a representative appointed by the mutasarrif.[31] He was to have

full executive powers, and Lebanon was to have its own police force and judiciary system. The new system of government remained in existence until World War I.

Generally the period was one of increasing prosperity for the Lebanese, and it seems that the Maronites got the best of the deal. Under the new regime the Maronites began to mature politically, and their narrow and sectarian outlook on Lebanon began to change. they came to regard Lebanon as their exclusive homeland. The Maronite Church became the exponent of the nascent concept of Lebanese nationalism.[32]

However, the period of the mutasarrifiyya was not without problems. The abolition of the feudal privileges rekindled the conflicts between Maronite peasants and Druzes, and in 1861 the Maronites revolted against the government of the first Mutasarrif (Dawud Pasha), led by Yusuf Karam. But in general the governors during this period were from outside Lebanon, and they were efficient, humane, and defended the integrity of Lebanon against the attempts of the Ottoman government to disturb this autonomy.[33] But it should be pointed out that some of the Maronite clergy were against Dawud Pasha and that during the mutsarrifiyya period Maronites considered north Lebanon as a Christian domain. However, the Maronite Patriarch Masʿad had to accept the new rule because he thought it to be the best deal Maronites could have at that time.

In 1915 the Ottoman government placed Lebanon under its direct military rule and abolished all of the privileges in Lebanon including the privileges of the Maronite Church. This action was considered unjust by the Maronite Patriarch Elias Huwayyik (d. 1931), who, in violation of long tradition, was forced to ask the Ottoman sultan for his investiture as a patriarch.

During World War I France had landed troops in Lebanon and by the end of the war had occupied Lebanon, according to the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement between France and Great Britain, signed in 1916.

When the peace conference met in 1919 to discuss the destiny of the Ottoman provinces liberated by the British and the French in the Middle East, many Lebanese, primarily the Maronites, wanted autonomy under French rule. Patriarch Huwayyik, also known as the Lebanese patriarch, played a great role at the peace conference in Paris to realize Lebanon's autonomy from Syria, especially since Prince Faysal was demanding the inclusion at the peace conference of Lebanon as part of Syria. In 1920 the Maronite dream of having an independent state under the French mandate was realized, and in 1926 the new state of Greater Lebanon had its own government and constitution.[34]

The Muslim community favored union with Syria, especially the people of Tripoli because of their economic interests with Syria. But some Sunnite Muslim families living in Beirut approved of the establishment of Greater Lebanon. In fact, the former president of Lebanon, Bishara al-Khuri, states that the proclamation of Greater Lebanon was done in the presence of the Sunnite Mufti of Lebanon.[35]

The Muslims of Lebanon had different opinions regarding the State of Greater Lebanon. They looked at it as a purely Christian state in which Muslim rights were only an appendage. To them Greater Lebanon meant unity with Syria; therefore, the Muslims of Lebanon held a conference called al-Sahil in 1933, where they discussed the unity of Syria although there was no unanimous opinion about the nature of the union.

Another conference was held in 1936 which revealed the disunity among the Muslims regarding the idea of Greater Lebanon. Even within the Maronite community there was no unanimity toward the support of French policy. Indeed, the Maronites came to look upon their patriarch as their only leader who represented their national interests rather than the French high commissioner.[36] So there was a conflict between the French authorities and the Maronite patriarchate. When Anton Arida was elected patriarch in 1932, the pope hesitated to send him the pallium. Indeed the Vatican wanted to change the process of electing the Maronite patriarch by Maronite bishops to that of having him chosen by the Vatican. However, the Maronite community registered great opposition.[37]

The conflict between Patriarch Arida and the French high commissioner was the result of the patriarch's drive for the independence of Lebanon. On December 25, 1935, the patriarch called a conference at the patriarchal seat at Bkerki to discuss the independence of Lebanon. In his opening speech he called for the achievement of the independence of Lebanon, provided that each community should receive its rights based on its status and importance and on the will of independent Lebanon to cooperate with its neighbors to the East and with the Western countries, especially France, Britain, and the United States.[38] This, to be sure, was the first attempt since the inception of the French mandate to create genuine harmony between the Christian community which rejected union with Syria and the Muslim community which demanded union with Syria and rejected French protection. In essence, the conference may be considered a forerunner of the future National Pact (1943) which was a political settlement between Christians and Muslims supported by the patriarch.

The impact of the patriarch's opposition to the French high commissioner and the French mandate was so tremendous that Muslim worshippers in Damascus left the mosque shouting, "There is no God but Allah and Patriarch Arida is the Beloved of Allah. There is no God but Allah and Taj al-Din al-Husayni is the enemy of Allah."[39] Taj al-Din was then the president of the Syrian state who did not oppose the French mandate as did the Maronite patriarch. In fact, some of the Maronite leaders, such as Emile Edde, who was a staunch friend of the French, collided with the French government when this government refused to appoint a Lebanese governor for Lebanon. Furthermore, he was not on good terms with the French high commissioner during his term in office as premier between 1929 and 1930 and as president of the republic from 1936 to 1941.

Some Maronites, such as Yusuf al-Suda, much to the chagrin of the French authorities, tried to instigate a joint effort between Christians and Muslims to achieve the independence of Lebanon from France. The fruit of his efforts was a meeting between Christians and Muslims in 1936 which yielded a kind of national pact similar to the one proclaimed in 1943. Indeed, even the Kata'ib (the Maronite Phalangists) founded by Pierre Jumayyil in 1936, collided with the French in 1937 over the question of the independence of Lebanon. While many Christians in 1943 assumed a neutral position regarding the question of independence for fear that independence would cause the Christians to be totally overwhelmed by a Muslim Arab majority, the Kata'ib was the only Christian popular group to support al-Kutla al-Dusturiyya (the Constitutional Bloc) and its president Bishara al-Khuri in their struggle for independence.[40]

This indicates that the Maronites' interest did not always coincide with that of the French and that some of the prominent leaders assumed a slavish position to the French. Simply, it was the fear of the Christian community that its very existence would disappear like a drop of water in an Arab ocean. Despite this inherent fear, the different religious communities were able to co-exist until the Palestinian refugees in 1948–1975, and later the radical Shiites from Iran, added new religious and demographic dimensions which rekindled the dormant sectarianism and the present crisis in Lebanon.[41]

Since the beginning of the mandate in 1920, conflict arose between the Maronite patriarchs and the various French high commissioners over the governance of Lebanon. Such conflict reveals the growth of the patriarch's temporal power which he gained during the mutasarrifiyya. However, under the mandate the patriarch began to lose his power while the

president gained more power. When the constitution of the State of Greater Lebanon was promulgated in 1926, it was the president, not the patriarch, who enjoyed exclusive power.

Under the mandate the Maronites obviously enjoyed a more favorable position than the Shiites, Sunnites, Druze, and even non-Roman Catholic Christian communities. Lebanon was essentially a country made up of sects, of which the Maronites occupied most of the prominent positions in the state. But sectarianism which was encouraged by the French was not acceptable to other communities, especially the Muslims, and after the Proclamation of the Independence of Lebanon most of the communal principles of the State of Greater Lebanon needed wider definition in order to be acceptable to the different religious groups.

There was a need for a fundamental change in the state which would create a sectarian balance accepted by all the communities in Lebanon. The result was the Proclamation of al-Mithaq al-Watani (National Pact) in 1943 worked out between the newly elected president of the Republic of Lebanon, Bishara al-Khuri, and the prime minister, the Sunnite, Riyad al-Sulh.

According to this National Pact, the Christians of Lebanon would abandon the idea of a Lebanon isolated from its Arab environment and accept Lebanon as an independent state within the Arab fold. The Muslims on their part would abandon the idea of returning to Syria those territories annexed to Lebanon in 1920, and lastly, the Arabs would reject foreign protection and cease their activity of subjugating Lebanon to either Syria or the Arab world. In other words, according to this pact, Lebanon would be an independent country for all Arab people regardless of their religion and would be one of the Arab states among a group comprising a community of Arab states.[42]

Basically, the pact was a compromise and not a radical change of the communal structure of Lebanon. The parliamentary system of Lebanon was still based on sectarian representation, the same as it was in the time of the mandate. The three key positions within the government were to be distributed as follows: the president of the republic would be a Maronite, the president of the parliament would be a Shiite, and the prime minister would be a Sunnite. It is no wonder that many writers, Maronite or otherwise, looked upon the National Pact as a perpetuation of sectarianism created by the Ottomans and reaffirmed by the French authorities.[43] The Maronite patriarch welcomed and supported the pact.

According to the Maronite Michel Ghurayyib, the National Pact was unfair and shameful. Its perpetuation of sectarianism caused today's

Lebanon to burn and collapse on its own people. Ghurayyib laments the fact that the pact created a tremendous political vacuum in Lebanon which instigated the Palestinians, then the Syrians, and finally all the Arabs to attempt to fill the vacuum.[44]

The pact was a settlement between two individuals and not between the different communities of Lebanon. It was a temporary remedy but not a permanent cure of sectarianism which is the source of the Lebanese crisis at present. This would later encourage the Druze and Shiite leaders to contend that the National Pact of 1943 was no longer feasible.

Things have changed, and the Druze and Shiite communities have increased in number and stature enough to demand a radical reconsideration of the contents of the National Pact, not on a sectarian but on a majority rule basis. From the point of view of al-Rabita al-Maruniyya (Maronite League), the National Pact was an indication of pragmatic faith in the history and aspirations of the Maronites. Above all, it was an expression of their utmost desire for coexistence with non-Maronite communities. Some Maronites argue that the pact assigned the presidency of the republic to the Maronites for the most essential reason—that the prominent position of the presidency stands as a symbol for the Christian minorities in the Arab-Islamic world.[45] However, in the aftermath of the civil war which broke out in 1975, young Maronite leaders, especially the late President Bashir Jumayyil, had a different outlook on the National Pact of 1943. A group of prominent Lebanese personalities of all religions and shades of religion met in March 1977, at Kaslik to discuss ways of finding a new political regime for Lebanon to replace the National Pact. At this meeting Bashir Jumayyil stated clearly that since 1958 the National Pact began to crumble before the eyes of the Lebanese, the Arabs, and the whole world. He added, "If the year 1958 was the beginning of the infection of the formula of the National Pact with cancer, 1975 should be considered the date of its real sickness." Jumayyil concludes that he rejects the formula of the pact and says that, "I personally participated in stabbing it with a dagger, burying it and placing guards over its grave so that it would not be resurrected once more."[46]

Patriarch Arida was pleased with the National Pact since it kept the presidency, the highest office in the government, in the hands of the Maronites. The patriarch's main concern was an independent Lebanon since Lebanon is the only country in the Arab world where the Christian, especially the Maronite, could enjoy some governmental authority. When on October 7, 1944, representatives of Arab states met at Alexandria and signed the Alexandria Protocol to establish the Arab League,

the Maronite patriarch objected to some of the wording in the protocol. The protocol called for an organization of Arab states which the patriarch and his advisors understood to mean a confederation in which Lebanon would be reduced to an insignificant minority amidst an overwhelmingly Muslim-Arab majority. The patriarch protested the formula of the protocol of the protected Arab League was not a confederation but a union of independent Arab states.[47]

The patriarch's concern for the independence of Lebanon as a Christian entity was manifested more in his appeal to the newly established United Nations in 1945. In his book *Lebnan al-Ta'ifi (Sectarian Lebanon)*, Lebanese writer Anis Sayigh makes a most startling statement in this context about Patriarch Arida. He states that in his appeal to the United Nations, Patriarch Arida demanded the creation of a Zionist state in Palestine and a Christian state in Lebanon. He even sent his Bishop Mubarak to France to propagate this demand. And when the United Nations committee came to Lebanon to investigate the Palestinian question, Bishop Mubarak appealed to the committee to realize the establishment of a Zionist state in Palestine and a Christian state in Lebanon.[48] Such action by the patriarch, based solely on Sayigh's statement, only shows the utmost concern of the patriarch that Lebanon, as the only Christian political entity in the Middle East, should retain that entity in the midst of a predominantly Muslim milieu. It also shows that the patriarch enjoyed great temporal powers and could interfere in the political affairs of the country.

The former president of Lebanon, Bishara al-Khuri, wrote how Patriarch Arida opposed his nomination as a member of the Parliament. He states that in 1932, some Maronite members of parliament went to the patriarchal seat at Bkerki to ask the patriarch not to endorse his nomination. Al-Khuri goes on to say that he tried to convince the patriarch that these members of Parliament were only playing a political trick against him, but the patriarch was not convinced. In fact, adds al-Khuri, Bishop Aql frequently visited the office of the French high commissioner to announce the patriarch's opposition of al-Khuri's candidacy as a member of the parliament.[49]

Until the end of his days, Patriarch Arida adhered to his belief that Lebanon constituted a unique entity separate from the rest of the Arab world. This was manifested in the letter he wrote only one month before his death on May 19, 1955, to President Camille Shamoun, which contained the official Maronite view of what should be the right policy for Lebanon. In this letter the patriarch made it clear that Lebanon had a distinctive way of life, tempered by historic, geographical, and spiritual

circumstances. He wrote that, as president, Shamoun should not engage Lebanon in alliances in the region. Here the patriarch was referring to the Turkish-Iraqi Pact of 1955, which became the nucleus of the Baghdad Pact. Finally, the patriarch stated that Lebanon should remain neutral and never become involved in the internal conflicts between Arab states.[50]

This rather narrow policy and Christian outlook on Lebanon was changed by the new Patriarch Bulus Maʿushi who succeeded Arida on May 30, 1955. The new patriarch adopted a much broader policy favoring cooperation with the Moslem neighbors of Lebanon. In fact, in March 1956, Patriarch Maʿushi visited the Moslem quarter of Basta in Beirut and told the Moslems who greeted him with great pomp that they were his dear kinsmen and that he was very happy to meet them on the plane of Arab nationalism. Amidst the cheers of his welcomers, who addressed him as the patriarch of the Arabs, the patriarch stressed the fact that Lebanon was for all peoples—Moslems and Christians—and that Lebanon would cooperate with its neighbors. In fact, as a symbol of Moslem-Christian unity, the Moslems of Basta hung the cross and the crescent in prominent places along the road where the patriarch was to pass.[51] But this new gesture of good will toward the Moslems was not shared by all the Maronite clergy. The point here is that the new patriarch became deeply involved in Lebanese politics, especially the controversy over the electoral reform. While President Shamoun maintained that members of the parliament should total sixty-six, the patriarch thought that the sum of eighty-eight would be more appropriate and representative of Lebanon. For this proposal, the patriarch was cheered by both Muslims and Christians.[52]

The patriarch's further involvement in politics came in the following year, 1957, when Lebanon accepted the Eisenhower Doctrine which provided economic and military aid for those countries of the Middle East which requested it. The Muslims and Druze, including Sa'ib Salam, Kamal Junblat, and others, formed the United National Front against Shamoun. The UFN included communists, Baʿthists, and members of the Constitutional Bloc of Bishara al-Khuri. On May 30, 1957, there was a demonstration lead by Sa'ib Salam against Camille Shamoun and his acceptance of the Eisenhower Doctrine during which Salam was injured. Patriarch Maʿushi held the government responsible for the injury suffered by Sa'ib Salam. It is said that Sa'ib Salam visited the patriarch at Bkerki, where the patriarch blessed his wounds.[53]

The tidal wave of Arab nationalism, led by President Abd al-Nasir since 1954 reached a new height in Egypt's union with Syria and the

formation of the United Arab Republic in 1958. To many Arab nationalists this was the beginning of a long-cherished dream of Arab unity, but to Lebanon the proclamation of the United Arab Republic was received with a great deal of fear and anxiety by Camille Shamoun and his supporters who came to believe that Arab unity would eventually jeopardize Lebanon's independence.

The patriarch was trying to adopt an open and cooperative approach to this Arab unity which caused President Nasir to praise the patriarch on his stand on Arab unity. President Nasir made it clear that he was prepared to support the national unity, traditions, and customs of Lebanon.[54] The attitude of the patriarch was interpreted by some that he was trying to gain greater popularity in the Arab world and appear as a friend of the nationalists. Perhaps he was of the opinion that Lebanon's interests were closely tied to those of the Arab states.

Maronite leaders, especially Pierre Jumayyil, president of the Phalangists, was alarmed at the patriarch's relations with Abd al-Nasir and in a very long letter addressed to the patriarch revealed his fear that the patriarch had succumbed to the pressures of the supporters of Lebanon's union with the UAR. He reminded the patriarch that his office and position were the essence of Lebanese history and that the Maronites had ultimate faith in their patriarch as a guardian of Lebanese traditions and independence. He appealed, therefore, to the patriarch to openly announce his position on the circulating rumors that Lebanon was joining the UAR.

In the meantime, it was rumored that the High Maronite Council had met and sent a letter to Pope Pius XII protesting the patriarch's policies and political activities.[55] On March 4, 1957, Pierre Jumayyil, leading a delegation, met with the patriarch. The patriarch told the delegation that Bkerki was above party politics and personal considerations. He stated that he believed unconditionally in the sovereignty and freedom of Lebanon because a free and sovereign Lebanon could best serve the Arab countries. He assured the delegation that Lebanon would not join any union or become a satellite to any country in the area.

The patriarch further interfered in the reelection of President Shamoun. According to the Lebanese constitution the president was to be elected for one term only, but it seems that Shamoun was trying to amend the constitution in order to pave the way for his reelection. The patriarch was against any revision of the constitution, which meant that he opposed a reelection of Shamoun. He probably thought that another Maronite, instead of Shamoun, would best serve the interests of the Maronite community.[56]

As the conflict between the patriarch and Shamoun continued over the election issue, tension increased when the government created a citizens militia which was considered by anti-Shamoun groups as a cover for the government to strengthen the position of Shamoun and his supporters. The patriarch was emphatic in condemning the creation of the militia.[57] There is some evidence that the patriarch tried to convince the general of the army, Fu'ad Shihab, to seek the office of the president, but Shihab declined. While the battle of the election was going on in Lebanon, the pro-Nasirites in Lebanon were active in their attempt to unseat Shamoun and reelect a pro-Nasir president.

Men and arms began to filter into Lebanon, which caused the United Nations Security Council to decide on June 11, 1958, to send a team to seal off Lebanon's borders with the UAR. In the meantime, Shamoun was under the impression that the crisis of Lebanon was caused by external intervention in the affairs of Lebanon, especially by Egypt's Nasir. The Iraqi coup d'etat of July 14, 1958, shocked the Lebanese government and, especially Shamoun, who thought that his government might be overthrown by outside Moslem forces.

As an immediate measure for the protection of his government, and of Lebanon, Shamoun requested the United States government, in accordance with the provisions of the Eisenhower Doctrine, to come to his aid. The United States responded and sent a Marine force to Lebanon, which landed in Beirut in 1958.

Finally, the election took place and Fu'ad Shihab, who was the patriarch's choice, was elected president. In the weeks following the election of Shihab there was much debate about the status of Lebanon, once the Marines were pulled out. Who would protect Lebanon? There was some suggestion that Lebanon should be internationalized, meaning that foreign forces should be stationed in Lebanon to preserve its integrity. Another suggestion was that Lebanon should assume a Swiss-styled neutrality. Patriarch Ma'ushi demanded neutrality of Lebanon in agreement with the Arab states.[58]

The point here is that the patriarch kept interfering in the affairs of Lebanon and speaking in the name of Lebanon as if he were the president of the republic. For example, when he visited the United States in September 1962, he and President Kennedy discussed the status and destiny of Lebanon and he showed great concern for the realization of a Lebanese World League.

During the spiritual retreat in May 1963, while the people were waiting for the patriarch to issue some spiritual instructions, he instead discussed the independence of Lebanon "which this Patriarchate con-

siders as its trust." On May 8, 1963, Lebanese writer Yusuf al-Khal wrote in the Beirut daily *al-Nahar* that with all his respect for the patriarch and faith in his religious wisdom, he believed that his statement regarding the independence of Lebanon was not necessary or beneficial.[59]

While Patriarch Maʿushi spoke almost on every political issue in Lebanon, his successor, Patriarch Antonius Khreish, realizing the harm done by his predecessor, tried to stay out of politics. Things had changed in Lebanon since the 1950s, and the new patriarch who assumed the dignity of his office in 1975 had to deal with problems which were either dormant or in the making under his predecessor. Perhaps the major problem was the plunging of Lebanon into civil war. Prior to the proclamation of the National Pact of 1943, the patriarch was the only dignitary who could speak in the name of the Maronite community and protect Maronite interests. After 1943, the president of the republic was Maronite, and he and other lay Maronite statesmen could speak for the Maronite community. This is not to say that the National Pact destroyed the status of the patriarch as the spokesman of his own people; it rendered it secondary to that of the president in civil matters. Nothing was more revealing of the antipathy of the Patriarch Khreish toward politics than the statement he made to the delegates of *al-Sayyad* magazine, Niqula Sayqali, Fu'ad Daʿbul, Munir Najjar, Maryam Abu Jauda, and Photine Muhanna, who met with him for almost three and a half hours. The patriarch told the delegates:

> I am head of a church, not a denomination. Therefore, no one should impose his opinion on the Patriarch. There is no solution (to the problems of Lebanon) except through secularization, or returning to the National Pact, after purging it from wrong practices. It is in the interest of the Muslims in the world and, especially, in Lebanon, that Lebanon should remain as it was.

The patriarch went on to say: "In the past the Maronites were alone and the Patriarch was everything. But when we had our own Republic in 1943, the Patriarch's function and role changed."[60]

The patriarch was apparently commenting on the civil war of 1975–1976 and Israel's attack and occupation of southern Lebanon in 1978. The civil war was the climax and not the cause of the present Lebanon's tragedy. Some attribute its cause to the sectarian nature of the Lebanese society and its division into no less than seventeen official communities recognized by the state with the right to administer their religious personal status law in religious courts. Under this confessionalism

no community was allowed to dominat the other, rather, they divided government positions and privileges in accordance with the formula of the National Pact of 1943.[61] Others attribute it to the rise of Arab nationalism in the 1950s under Nasir. Yet others attribute it to the displacement of the Palestinians by Israel and the creation of the refugee problem from which Lebanon suffered the most.[62]

Closely associated with the Palestinian refugees in Lebanon is the Cairo Agreement of 1969, followed by a similar agreement, the Malcart Agreement of May 15–17, 1973, which, in the words of the Maronite member of the Lebanese parliament, Raymond Edde, is "the calamity which befell the Christians of Lebanon; indeed all of Lebanon."[63] This agreement was negotiated in Cairo by a Lebanese delegation headed by General Amil al-Bustani and a Palestinian delegation headed by Yasir Arafat, head of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), in the presence of representatives of the United Arab Republic. The delegates who met on November 3, 1969, gave the right to the Palestinians, in cooperation with the local authorities, to arm themselves and to keep the Palestine revolution alive through an armed struggle but without violating the safety and sovereignty of Lebanon.[64] In other words, the Cairo Agreement of 1969 recognized the status of the Palestinians in Lebanon as a military entity, separate from that of Lebanon, for the purpose of carrying on an armed struggle against Israel. It is of great significance to point out that the agreement was endorsed by both Camille Shamoun and Pierre Jumayyil, especially the latter who would become the most formidable enemy of the Palestinians.

Encouraged by this agreement, the Palestinians began to acquire arms, storing them at Tal al-Zaʿtar in the heart of Beirut and not always informing the Lebanese authorities of their acquisition of these arms. By 1975, Tal al-Zaʿtar had become a fully equipped arsenal which the Palestinians could use not only against Israel but against a weak Lebanese government which had only a token military force. Taking advantage of the weakness of the Lebanese government and probably encouraged by some Arab states, the Palestinians believed they could take over Lebanon and turn it into a Palestinian base from which they could fight against Israel. They cherished this dream since they lost their power in Jordan when, in Black September of 1970, King Husayn of Jordan almost decimated the Palestinians who had flexed their muscles against him and acted as a state within a state.

Having lost their position in Jordan, they turned toward Lebanon which became the only suitable ground for their operations. The Israeli raids on southern Lebanon in 1971 and 1972 and the shelling of the

Palestinians' camp and the Palestinians' limited retaliation increased the tension between the Palestinians and the Lebanese government. The tension continued to build up until April 12, 1975, when the Palestinians thought that the time was ripe to accomplish their take-over of Lebanon.

On that day, a Sunday, Pierre Jumayyil, head of the Maronite Kata'ib (Phalangists) attended a ceremony of consecration of a new Maronite church at Ayn al-Rummana in East Beirut. As Jumayyil left the church building with his guard, a car carrying Palestinians immediately appeared and opened fire. Three persons were killed, including Jumayyil's private escort. The Phalangists opened fire on a bus carrying thirty armed Palestinians which arrived at the spot, and all of the passengers were killed. The civil war had begun.[65] The Druze leader, Kamal Junblat of the Progressive Socialist Party, sought to punish the Phalangists by excluding them from the government. Jumayyil ordered his two ministers in the Rashid al-Sulh cabinet to resign, but the other ministers in the cabinet, especially the Druze Majid Arslan, were bitterly opposed to Junblat.

Patriarch Khreish made it clear that the exclusion of the Phalangists from government was unacceptable to the church.[66] The Phalangist ministers remained in the cabinet. Jumayyil found himself fighting the same people whom he had supported by endorsing the Cairo Agreement which allowed them to arm themselves. Although the patriarch wanted the two Maronite Phalangist ministers to stay in the government, he was not acting from a position of power but rather expressing his own point of view. The religious power was in the hands of the Maronite Monastic Orders and their head, the Abbot Sharbal Kassis, who became the heart and soul of the Phalangist party.

It was Kassis who was the unofficial head of the Phalangists and formulator of some of their extreme manifestos in support of a sovereign Lebanon. To demonstrate their support of the Maronite Phalangists against non-Christian groups, these monks ran to take up positions around their monasteries with cassocks tucked up above their knees and kalashnikov rifles in their hands.[67] This indicates that the patriarch was no longer able to speak for the Maronite community on political matters.

The history of Lebanon from 1975 until the present has been discussed by other writers. It is sufficient to give a sketch of the events in Lebanon which have bearing on the stance of the Maronite church and community from these events.

In 1976 Tal al-Za'tar was stormed by the Phalangists, supported by other Christian groups. Although the Palestinians lost their arsenal and a

great number of victims, yet the civil war did not break their backs. They regrouped themselves and moved their forces southward to shell the northern parts of Israel. In 1976 the Arab League decided to send an Arab deterrent force to Lebanon to be subsidized by the Arab oil-producing countries, especially Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Syria was one of the Arab countries which participated in this force.

Of all the Arab countries, Syria was greatly concerned about the situation in Lebanon for political and economic reasons. Since it is Lebanon's neighbor, it could play a greater role in the internal affairs of Lebanon. But the Syrian forces are still in Lebanon today because the Phalangists in 1976 asked to help them against the Palestinians.

On March 15, 1978, Israel attacked Lebanon to ward off Palestinians in a raid against its northern borders. The attack was repeated in June 1982, when the Israeli forces reached Beirut, and the Palestinian leaders were forced to leave Lebanon and seek asylum in Tunisia. On March 6, 1985, Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres told *Le Monde* that Pierre Jumayyil and his son, Bashir Jumayyil, sought aid from Israel in the form of arms and funds, and Israel rushed to help the Phalangists. One of the outcomes of this invasion was the massacre of Palestinians in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila. But it should not be forgotten that the Palestinians were responsible for similar massacres of innocent Christian clergy and civilians in Damor and other southern villages. If Israel wreaked havoc in Lebanon because of the invasion of the country in 1978 and again in 1982, Syria and some Arab states were no less responsible for the ruin of Lebanon by providing arms and money to the Palestinians and other Lebanese groups.

When the Israelis invaded Lebanon in 1982, they were confident that Bashir Jumayyil, their ally, would be most willing to sign an agreement recognizing Israel. All that Israeli Prime Minister Begin wanted to see in the summer of 1982 was either a strong central government in Lebanon friendly with Israel or a peace agreement signed between the two countries. Bashir Jumayyil hesitated to sign an agreement with Israel and looked at such an agreement as a part of a comprehensive solution in the Middle East. On September 14, 1982, Bashir Jumayyil was killed when a bomb was thrown into the Phalangist headquarters at Ashrafiyya. He was succeeded by his brother, Amin, as the new president of Lebanon.

Amin Jumayyil was Israel's choice. He was elected in an army barracks with the support of the Israeli Minister of Defense Ariel Sharon. More determined and less compulsive than his brother in conducting political affairs, Amin signed an agreement with Israel on May 17,

1983. Unperturbed by Arab and Syrian reaction to this agreement, Amin declared that he would "throw Syrian bombs back to Damascus."[68] Later, his position changed and under pressure or persuasion by the president of Syria, Hafiz Asad, Jumayyil revoked the May 17 agreement with Israel three months later, and for all intents and purposes Jumayyil became a Syrian puppet. The revocation of the agreement with Israel must have displeased the United States which, it seems, abandoned Amin Jumayyil.

Today the Maronites under the Jumayyils are weaker than they were before; they even occupy a smaller part of Lebanon than they did earlier. The position of Amin Jumayyil today is very precarious, and Lebanon is a less viable state. Perhaps the most detrimental blow to Amin Jumayyil, from a Maronite point of view, is the recent reconciliation between Sulayman Franjieh, former Maronite president of Lebanon, and Eli Hubayqa, commander of the Lebanese forces, founded by Bashir Jumayyil in the spring of 1976 to organize the Christian war effort in Lebanon.

On June 13, 1978, a group of the Lebanese forces attacked the mansion of President Franjieh in Ihden, massacring, in cold blood, Sulayman's son, Tony, who was a member of the Parliament, his wife, Vera, their two daughters, their maid, and their dog. Although Bashir swore that he had no idea that Tony and his wife were inside the mansion, his excuses did not convince the Lebanese.[69] On Thursday, August 8, 1985, Sulayman Franjieh and Eli Hubayqa buried the hatchet by hugging each other. Only twenty-four hours after this reconciliation, which allegedly restored unity to two Christian opponents, President Franjieh demanded that Amin Jumayyil step down, indicating the deep rift between Maronite ranks and Maronite leaders in Lebanon.[70] This also indicates that the present president of Lebanon is rejected by the Christian front as he is also rejected by the Islamic front.[71]

Today's Lebanon is still suffering from sectarianism much more than in past generations. The present distribution of the major religious communities, that is, Christians, mainly Maronites, Muslims, and Druze in their respective areas, indicates the de facto partition of the country. Beirut, the capital city, is divided by a green line into a Muslim west and a Christian east. The central government has no authority over most of the country and exists only in name. What aggravates this chaotic condition is the presence of the Syrians in the east and the Israelis in the south of Lebanon. This once beautiful country, described as the "Switzerland of the East," is nothing now but a heap of rubble.

Where do the Maronite Church and community stand on the present deplorable condition of Lebanon? We have stated earlier that after the civil war of 1975, the temporal position of the Maronite patriarch weakened tremendously. Patriarch Khreish recognized this weakness and admitted that he is a head of a church, not merely a denomination. In other words, the patriarch could not speak for the Maronite community, nor could he influence the political affairs of Lebanon. When he was asked whether Bkerki played any role in achieving peace among the different warring factions, the patriarch answered, "We in the Patriarchal Seat (Bkerki) have no deterrent military force. We only have moral power which we have engaged in the service of Lebanon."[72]

From the different statements Patriarch Khreish made to the press, in meeting with clergymen from other Christian denominations, or meeting with Muslim and Druze religious men and dignitaries, we learn that Patriarch Khreish advocates a peaceful coexistence between the Christians and non-Christians but without jeopardy to the Maronites as a significant community. He rejects the accusation that he prefers to stay out of politics. He believes that Lebanon is for the Lebanese. "It is true," he says, "that the Maronites came first to this country, but it is also true that Lebanon is for all those who live in it."

The patriarch realizes that Lebanon, with its confessionalism, is a unique country, which requires a unique type of government. He reveals a great truth when he states that the Christians of Lebanon suffer from a fear complex vis-à-vis the Muslims. They fear that the Muslim majority will swallow them up or cause them to lose their Christian heritage. This fear, the patriarch continues, was an artificial complex before 1943. But after this date and especially after the events of 1975, it became a real one. He explains that the National Pact of 1943 stated that the president of Lebanon should be a Maronite. What is the use of being a Maronite president? Could a Maronite president prevent civil war in Lebanon?

Finally, Patriarch Khreish proposed ʿalmana (secularization) as the only solution to Lebanon's confessionalism. What he means by ʿalmana is that the Lebanese state should have no official religion and that the freedom of everyone should be respected and religious ceremonies conducted in a manner compatible with the public order. In other words, the patriarch emphasizes the concept of the separation of church and state. But if these principles cannot be implemented, the other solution is to retain the formula of the National Pact of 1943 with some modification. However, the patriarch insists that the ʿalmana is the only radical solution.[73] The Vatican seems to share the patriarch's opinion of peaceful

coexistence among the religious communities in Lebanon.

According to Cardinal Etchegaray, the papal delegate, who visited Lebanon July 4–11, 1985, from the beginning of the civil war in 1975 until the present the Vatican's policy had one objective: brotherly coexistence between Muslims and Christians. Cardinal Etchegaray emphatically rejected the idea of the partition or cantonization of Lebanon. He made it clear that the Vatican advocates one independent Lebanon where all religious communities live side by side. What the cardinal is saying in essence is that the Vatican is against the partition of Lebanon proposed by the Phalangists or the cantonization (like the Swiss cantons) proposed by Camille Shamoun. The cardinal stated that Pope John Paul II believes that without peace and harmony between the different religious communities, Lebanon will not be able to exist as a viable state.[74]

The Maronite monastic orders seem to have a different opinion than their spiritual head, Patriarch Khreish. According to the member of the Lebanese Parliament, Raymond Edde, the Maronite monks speak of the partition of Lebanon. They maintain that the Christians of Lebanon will never have a peaceful life unless they have their own separate political existence, separate from the Shiites, Sunnites, and Druze.[75] Of course, what Edde means by "political existence" is a separate Christian or more specifically, Maronite state. This view of the Maronite monks contradicts that of Patriarch Khreish, who advocates the secularization of the Lebanese state.

But why do these monks contradict their patriarch and plunge themselves into politics? Partly because of their belief that the patriarch has shunned his historical role, not only as the religious but also the temporal leader of the Maronites. The patriarch is politically unable to act anymore. Moreover, Maronite lay leaders, such as Pierre Jumayyil (d. 1983) and Camille Shamoun, had exhausted their political energy and they are no longer able to withstand the present political challenge in Lebanon. Therefore, the monastic orders are the only Maronite institutions capable of rising to the challenge and providing strong and effective leadership for the Maronite community. The Maronite monks are cohesive and less vulnerable than the lay leaders. They operate many schools and are in contact with Maronite congregations. Thus they command more respect and trust from the public than the politicians.[76]

The Maronite monks believe that Lebanon is a confessional society whose characteristic is essentially Christian, that is, Maronite. It is a mix of many cultures most outstanding of which is Maronitism. This is why the monks endorse the National Pact of 1943 as the document which

reflects the panoramic structure of the Lebanese society. Therefore, the monks insist that the Maronite president of Lebanon should have broader authority as a Maronite, to protect the Maronite community. Otherwise, the monks maintain that without extensive authority, the Maronitism of the president is meaningless.[77]

In brief, the Maronite monks maintain that Lebanon is synonymous with Maronite history and ethos; that its Maronitism antedates the Arab conquest of Syria and Lebanon and that Arabism is only a historical accident.[78] Of utmost significance in this respect are the views of Abbot Bulus Nuʿman, present head of the Maronite Monastic Orders. Speaking of the Maronite spiritual heritage as the embodiment not only of the Maronite community but of the cultural character of Lebanon, Nuʿman makes the following fundamental statement: "Maronitism is an Antiochean religio-civic doctrine having exclusive characteristics directly associated with an ancient civilization; the Syrian-Aramaic civilization."[79] What Abbot Nuʿman is saying in essence is that the Maronites are of Syriac-Aramaic stock. In other words they are not Arabs. This concept of Maronitism, which in reality means "Maronite nationalism" has been elaborated by Rev. Butrus Daww. It has been thoroughly analyzed in previous chapters. The statement of Abbot Nuʿman is the key to present dilemma of the Maronites in Lebanon. It is the only solution to their identity crisis. The Maronites should decide whether they are Syriac-Aramaic people with a distinct language and culture or they are Arabs. The whole thrust of this book shows that the Maronites are Syriac-Aramaic by culture and their church is a branch of the Syrian Church of Antioch. The language and rites of their church are Syriac. In fact, their whole heritage, language, prayer books, and saints are those of the Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) Church. They are not, as some of their writers claim, Mardaites or Jarajima. If they are of Syriac-Aramaic stock and heritage, which the author believes they are, the Maronites should revive this heritage as a solution to their identity crisis. Or else they have to accept the fact that their existence is tied in with the Arab nation and that they should share Lebanon with other religious communities.[80]

The Maronites of Lebanon maintain today that Lebanon is a Christian country for Christians. It is their homeland and as Christians they refuse to live in any "dhimmitude," that is, Christians under the protection of Islam. They have and will continue to testify to their Christianity in the Middle East. They want to celebrate their rites and traditions whenever they wish. In the words of the late president of Lebanon,

Bashir Jumayyil, "Lebanon is our homeland and will remain a homeland for Christians. . . . We want to continue to christen, to celebrate our rites and traditions, our faith and our creed whenever we wish . . . we refuse to live in any "dhimmitude!"[81]

Notes

1—ORIGIN OF THE TERM MARONITE

1. See the *Ten Treatises* of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, in Vatican MS 146 dated 1392, written in both Syriac and Garshuni (Arabic written in Syriac script). Cf. Yusuf Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin al-Jaliyya ʿan Haqiqat Amr al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya (The Essence of Proofs Concerning the Truth about the Maronite Denomination)* (n.p and n.d). However, we may infer from the author's introduction that the book was published in 1911. Deryan used another old copy of the same (MS 47) at the village of Ashqut, Lebanon, which he states is identical with the Garshuni copy of Vatican MS 146, from Deryan, *Lubab,* 259–60. See also below Chapter 7, note 60, and Georg Graf, *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur* 11 (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1947), 98–101. These *Treatises* were edited and published by Philip al-Samrani in *al-Manara* 8 (1936) after the Garshuni MS 203 in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

2. Istefan al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya (History of the Maronite Denomination),* ed. Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni (Beirut, 1890), 16, hereafter referred to as *Tarikh.* The original manuscript written in Garshuni is in the Vatican Library MS 395, entitled *Al-Iḥtijaj ʿan Asl al-Mawarina wa Thabatihim fi al-Amana, ta'lif Mar Istefanos al-Duwayhi al-Sayyid al-Patriarch al-Mukarram (Apology for the Origin of the Maronites and Their Adherence to the Faith, by the Honorable Mar Istefan al-Duwayhi, the Patriarch).*

3. Faustus Nairon, *Dissertatio de origine, nomine ac religione Maronitarum* (Rome, 1679), 9–10.

4. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 8–12.

5. Ibid., 16.

6. Ibid., 12.

7. Ibid., 12, 54–62, cf. Vatican MS 146, 1. Cf. P. Paul Naaman, *Théodoret de Cyr et le Monastère de Saint Maroun: Les Origines des Maronites* (Universite Saint-Esprit, Kaslik, Lebanon, 1971).

8. Yusuf al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud fi Tafnid Zaʿm al-Khuri Yusuf Dawud* (Beirut, 1871), 258. The book contains a Latin translation with the title *Summa Confutationum Contra Assertiones Sacerdotis Joseph David.* See also by the same author, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal fi Tarikh al-Mawarina al-Mu'assal (A Comprehensive Collection of the Authentic History of the Maronites)* (Beirut, 1905), 15–17. For the opinions of earlier Maronite writers on this point see Yuhanna Battista Badhinjana, *Mir'at al-Haqq al-Wadiyya fi Sharaf al-Milla al-Maruniyya (The Shining Mirror of Truth about the Honor of the Maronite Sect),* 24–78. The copy used here is the Bibliothèque Orientale Université Saint Joseph Library, Beirut, Lebanon Arabic MS 785 completed in Aleppo in 1768. This copy was made in 1886 by Sarhal Yusuf Asaf from a copy dated 1829. See also Bulus Masʿad, *al-Durr al-Manzum Radd ʿala al-Masa'il wa al-Ajwiba al-Mumdat bi Ism al-Batriark Maximus Mazlum (Strung Pearls in Refuting the Questions and Answers signed by the Patriarch Maximus Mazlum).* I have used here the manuscript copy at Dayr al-Kraym Arabic MS 36, 29, 49. This MS was copied by Ziyada Ibn Tannus Murad in 1849. Another unpaginated copy of the same is contained in Dayr al-Kraym MS 36a. See also *Kitab al-Muhamat ʿan al-Mawarina wa Qiddisihim (A Defense of the Maronites and Their Saints)* (n.p., 1899), 105. This book, which contains several works in defense of the Maronites and their saints, was compiled by the Maronite priest, Afram al-Dirani, and revised by Saʿid al-Shartuni, The works it contains are: *Risala li al-Tayyib al-Dhikr al-Khuri Anton al-Qayyla al-Beiruti Tilmidh Roma (A Treatise by the late Chorepiscopus Anton al-Qayyala of Beirut, a graduate of Rome),* 1–101; Istefan Awwad Assemani, *al-Kitab al-Jadali (Book of Disputation),* 103–457; Mikha'il Fadil and Elias al-Jumayyil, *al-Ajwiba al Saniyya ʿan al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya (Resplendent Apologies Concerning the Maronite Denomination),* 458–92; Bulus Masʿad, *al-Malikiyya wa al-Maruniyya (The Malkites and Maronites),* 493–513; and a lengthy treatise in defense of the Maronites by the Patriarch Yusuf Istefan, pp. 223–457. This book compiled by al-Dirani shall be hereafter referred to as *Muhamat.*

9. Joseph Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino Vaticana* 1 (Rome, 1719–28), 509.

10. Yusuf al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 258–59, and *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufussal,* 41–42.

11. For the different opinions of Maronite writers regarding the origin of the terms Maronite and Marada (Mardaites), and how and when these terms were originated, see Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj al-Rahina fi Ibtal Daʿawa al-Mawarina (A Collection of Established Proofs in Refutation of the Pretensions of the Maronites)* (Leipzig, 1908), 58–67.

12. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 46, 50. On this second Marun see Vatican Syriac and Garshuni MS 146, 1, and Dayr al-Kraym Garshuni MS 31.

2—THE IDENTITY OF THE ASCETIC MARUN

1. For the text of this letter see Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 52, 630; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 18–19; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 5–6; Fu'ad Afram al-Bustani, *Mar Marun* (Beirut, 1965), 7; and Butrus Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina al-Dini wa al-Siyasi wa al-Hadari (The Religious, Political and Cultural History of the Maronites)* 1 (Beirut, 1970), 51. A summary of this book is made by the Chorepiscopus, Yusuf Awn, and published under the title *Mar Marun wa al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya (St. Marun and the Maronite Denomination)* (n.p., 1971).

2. See, for example: al-Bustani, *Mar Marun,* 7; Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 51; and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 6. For the year 414 as the date of this letter see Yusuf

Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan al-Am (General History of Lebanon)* 1 (n.p. and n.d.), 158.

3. Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan,* 158. For the speculations over Marun's death, which are both confused and confusing, see Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 52. For a criticism of Muzhir's dates for the letter of Saint John Chrysostom, see Ignatius Yaʿqub III, Patriarch of Antioch, *Nafh al-Abir aw Sirat Mar Severus al-Kabir (Diffusion of Fragrance in Relating the Life Story of Saint Severus the Great)* (Damascus, 1970), 78.

4. There were several ascetics named Marun in Syria in the fifth and sixth centuries. They include Marun to whom Severus of Antioch wrote a letter; Marun to whom Jacob of Sarug wrote a letter; Marun of Ayn Zarba, to whom Philoxenus of Mabug wrote a letter; Marun of Amida, who is reported to have brought a dead child back to life (thought to be the sixth-century Syrian historian John of Ephesus); Marun, abbot of a monastery in the mountain of Edessa (present-day Urfa, Turkey), who was banished by Emperor Justin I; and Marun, abbot of the Monastery of the Tree in Darayya in southern Syria, who, with 135 other abbots in 570, is reported to have signed a statement containing the orthodox (anti-Chalcedonian) faith. See Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 78–79, where he documents the sources on these different Maruns. In sum, the claim of Maronites, and especially of al-Duwayhi, that the ascetic Marun to whom Saint John Chrysostom wrote a letter is the same Marun who they claim is the source of their church and name is not supported by historical evidence. See al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 8–12. A contemporary writer, Professor Aziz Atiya, who follows Yusuf al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 3–13, considers the ascetic Marun as the one to whom Chrysostom wrote this particular letter. See Aziz Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity* Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967), 394.

5. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 20.

6. For Theodoret's *Religiosa Historia* see Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 82, 1279–1495. For Theodoret's hatred and contempt of Saint Cyril of Alexandria see his letter (Ep. 180) quoted at the Fifth Council, in which he expresses joy at the death of Saint Cyril, calling him "a bad man whose departure gives joy to those who survive." See Giovanni D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et Amplissima Collectio* 9 (Florence and Venice, 1758–1798), 295.

7. Theodoret in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 82, 1418–1419. For a brief account of the *Religiosa Historia* see the introduction to the English translation of Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History* published together with the *Ecclesiastical History* of Evagrius (London, 1854), 7–8. This translation is made from the Greek without the name of the translator.

8. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 82, 1418–1419; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 17–18; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 4–5; and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 74. The claim of the Maronite Bishop Pierre Dib that "It appears from the description of Theodoret that St. Marun was a priest," does great violence to Theodoret's account of Marun. See Pierre Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* translated into English by Rev. Seely Beggiani (Beirut, 1971), 3. Aziz Atiya, relying on contemporary Maronite sources, incorrectly states that "St. Marun (350–433) espoused the monastic life and retired to live as a recluse on the bank of the Orontes between Apamea and Emesa (Hims)" while Theodoret of Cyrus, our only authority on the ascetic Marun, says that Marun lived on top of a mountain in the district of Cyrus in north Syria (Syria Prima), whereas Apamea and Emesa are situated in southern Syria (Syria Secunda). See Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity,* 394, together with the footnote.

9. This picture is found in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* between pp. 16 and 17.

10. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 3. Another Maronite writer considers Marun the founder of a religious community but without historical evidence. See Rev. Paul Abraham, *The Maronites of Lebanon: The Staunch Catholics of the Near East* (Wheeling, West

Virginia, 1931), 30. Dib's statement that "the disciples who had united around Marun formed the first nucleus of the Maronite Church" is groundless. See Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 4. Another Maronite makes an equally groundless statement that Marun was an abbot and a great monk who battled bravely for the Catholic faith and who gave his name to his disciples and followers "Maronite." See the introduction of Rev. Peter A. Eid to Rev. Pierre Raphael, *The Role of the Maronites in the Return of the Oriental Churches* (Youngstown, Ohio, 1946), 13.

11. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 17–22. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 133–42 discusses the characteristics of what he considers as the "ascetic school" of Marun. The Reverend Abraham goes a step further by making the historically groundless statement that "Marun left his disciples a legacy which they were to keep as a trust—the preservation of the Catholic faith." See Abraham, *Maronites of Lebanon,* 29.

12. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 75.

13. Daww refers to A. J. Festugière, *Antioché Païenne et Chrétienne* (Paris, 1959) but without identifying the page.

14. Festugière, *Antioché Païenne,* 199.

15. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 123.

16. One of these biographies written by Cosmas, one of Saint Simon's disciples is available in three Syriac MSS. Assemani published one of these biographies contained in a Vatican MS in his *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum* 11 (Rome, 1748), 273–394. The remaining two biographies are contained in the British Museum MSS Add. 12174 and Add. 14484. The Reverend Paul Bedjan published Assemani's text collated with the texts in the two British Museum MSS in his *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* 4 (Leipzig, 1894). An English translation of the text published by Bedjan was made by Rev. Frederick Lent, "The Life of St. Simeon the Stylite: A Translation of the Syriac Text in Bedjan's Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum, Vol. IV," *Journal of the American Oriental Society (JAOS)* 35 (1915–1917), 103–198. There is yet another Syriac biography of St. Simon written by Marqolon, a disciple of Saint Simon, most likely unknown to Western scholars. This biography, transcribed in the fourteenth century, comprises ninety-eight pages of medium size. It is at the Library of the Patriarchate of the Syrian Orthodox Church in Damascus. Cf. Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 92, footnote 1. For Theodor Nöldeke's account of Saint Simon see Theodor Nöldeke, *Sketches from Eastern History,* trans. into English by John Sutherland Black (Beirut, 1963), 207–226. For Evagrius's account of Saint Simon see Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 1, Chapter 13.

17. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 138.

18. Ibid.

19. Festugière, *Antioché Païenne,* 229, and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 139.

20. See Lent's translation of the "Life of St. Simeon" in *JAOS* cited above in note 16.

21. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 507, and Masʿad, *al-Durr al-Manzum,* 288–89. Aziz Atiya makes the historically groundless statement that "the fourth-century St. Maro was the apostle of Lebanese Christianity." See Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity,* 395.

22. The disciples who left Jerusalem after the persecution caused by the stoning of Stephen must have passed through Phoenicia (Lebanon) on their way to Antioch. See *Acts* 11:19. By the fourth century the church was well established in Lebanon, especially in the time of the Emperor Constantine the Great. In his *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 1, Chapters 5 and 6, Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, mentions the names of Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, Theodotus, bishop of Laodicea, Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, and many other bishops who had participated in the Arian controversy.

23. Theodor Nöldeke, *Sketches from Eastern History,* 220.

24. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 260. Howard Crosby Butler, who has thoroughly studied the churches and monasteries of Syria including the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite and neighboring monasteries, mentions nothing about Daww's allegation that the monasteries in the vicinity of Saint Simon's Church and Monastery were under "Maronite" jurisdiction. See Howard Crosby Butler, *Early Churches In Syria,* ed. and completed by E. Baldwin Smith, (Princeton, N.J.: Department of Art and Archaeology of Princeton University, 1929), 61–62, and entire Chapter 4, 83–112, especially 97–110, where the author discusses the Monastery of Saint Simon the Stylite and the monasteries in its vicinity.

25. Ibid., 260–61.

3—THE MONASTERY OF MARUN

1. Pierre Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 3; Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 54; and al-Bustani, *Mar Marun,* 28. See also Aziz Atiya, who relies on a contemporary Maronite source, in *History of Eastern Christianity,* Chapter 11, footnote 8.

2. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 54.

3. Henri Lammens, *Tasrih al-Absar fi ma Yahtawi Lebnan min al-Athar (Setting Sights on the Historical Sites in Lebanon)* 11 (Beirut, 1914), 79.

4. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 6–7.

5. For the geographical divisions of Syria at the end of the fourth century see Philip K. Hitti, *History of Syria* (New York, 1951) 351–52.

6. For al-Duwayhi's opinion see Ferdinand Taoutel, *Watha'iq Tarikhiyya ᶜan Halab: Akhbar al-Mawarina wa ma Ilayhim min 1606 ila Yawmina (Historical Documents about Aleppo: The History of the Maronites from 1606 to the Present)* 1 (Beirut, 1958), 25–34, and Daww *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 64.

7. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 63–64.

8. For a description of the ruins of Qalᶜat Simᶜan see Bulus Jwun, "Qalᶜat Simᶜan," *al-Mashriq* 11 (1899), 399–409, and Subhi Sawwaf, *Qalᶜat Simᶜan* (Aleppo, 1961).

9. Charles Clermont-Ganneau in *Études d' Archeòlogie Orientale* 11 (Paris, 1880-1897), 55.

10. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 67.

11. See Theodoret in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 82, col. 1419.

12. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* p. 29.

13. Ibid., 29, 32.

14. See the *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 11th ed., 12 (Cambrige, 1910), 869 for Hama and for Homs or Hims. For more information on Emesa see Philip Carrington, *The Early Christian Church* 11 (Cambridge, 1957), 259, 442–43, 473–74.

15. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 29–32, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 7–8.

16. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 100.

17. Yaᶜqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 78, and the sources from which he drew his information. Cf. above Chapter 2, note 4.

18. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 497.

19. Theodoret in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 82, Chapter 3. See also Festugière, *Antioché Païenne,* 252–53, and Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 86.

20. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 89.

21. Yaqut al-Hamawi, *Muᶜjam al-Buldan (The Dictionary of Countries)* 2 (Beirut, 1956), 696.

22. Ibid., 11, 533–34.

23. Ibn Abd al-Haqq, *Marasid al-Ittilaᶜ fi Asma al-Amkina wa al-Biqaᶜ (Stations of Observing the Names of Places and Localities)* (Leiden, 1852), 420.

24. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 151.

25. Ibid., 156.

26. *Al-Durr al-Multaqat min Kull Bahr wa Safat (Pearls Picked from Every Sea and Basket),* comp. Muhammad Ibn Ali Ibn Mahmud al-Katib al-Dimashqi, completed in A.H. 743/1352 A.D. This work is still in manuscript form at the British Museum Arabic MS Add. 19408, cols. 133–34.

27. Al-Masᶜudi, *Kitab al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf (Book of Admonition and Supervision)* (Cairo, 1938), 131–32.

28. Al-Masᶜudi, *Muruj al-Dhahab wa Maᶜadin al-Jawhar (Meadows of Gold and Mines of Jewels)* 111 (Cairo, 1938), 119.

29. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 32.

30. Abu al-Fida, *al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar (Extract of the History of Mankind)* (Historia Anteislamica Arabice), ed. H. O. Fleischer (Leipzig, 1831), 112.

31. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 61.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Abu al-Fida, *al-Mukhtasar,* 3, 112.

35. Lammens quoting Abu al-Fida's *Taqwim al-Buldan (The Geography of Countries),* 114, has misunderstood Abu al-Fida as saying that Emperor Marcian enlarged the Monastery of Marun. Abu al-Fida states that Marcian built, not enlarged, the Monastery of Marun.

36. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 32–33.

37. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 86.

38. Ibid., 11, 84.

39. François Nau, *Opuscules Maronites* 11 (Paris, 1899–1900), 22.

40. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 84–85.

41. Ibid.

42. P. M. Jullien, *Sinai et Syrie,* 178, quoted by Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 87.

43. Ibid.

44. Festugière, *Antioché Païenne,* 252–53.

45. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 89.

46. Ibid., 11, 90.

4—EARLIEST SOURCES ON THE MONASTERY OF MARUN

1. See Dionysius Tal Mahri in the Syriac text of Mikha'il Rabo (Michael the Great or the Syrian), *Makhthabanuth Zabne (Chronicle)* (Paris, 1899), 408–410. This Syriac copy was discovered by the French Orientalist Rev. Jean B. Chabot, who translated it into French and published it in three volumes entitled *Chronique De Michel Le Syrien* (Paris, 1899–1905). The Syriac text forms the fourth volume of this work. The date of publication on the front of the Syriac version gives 1899 as the date of publication, while the French title at the end of this copy gives 1910 as the date of its publication.

2. Athanasius VI, commonly known as Gammala, was patriarch of Antioch and not a "Catholicos," a rank inferior to that of patriarch, as J. L. Von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* 1, trans. into English by James Murdock (New York, 1844), 451,

has erroneously maintained. The statement of A. J. Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Graeca* 10, 204 quoted in Mosheim that in his meeting with the Emperor Heraclius, Patriarch Athanasius "suggested to the emperor that the belief in one nature of Christ might induce the people to receive the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon," is historically groundless. Equally groundless is the claim of Asad Rustam based on the *Chronica Minora,* a Syriac source, that during their discussion "the emperor recognized Athanasius as the patriarch of Antioch in return for the latter's willingness to accept the Council of Chalcedon and that the patriarch accepted." See Asad Rustam, *Kanisat Madinat Allah Antakiya al-Uzma (Church of the City of God the Great Antioch)* 1 (Beirut, 1958), 435–36. There is no such statement in the *Chronica Minora* 1, ed. I. Guidi, in *Corpus Scripttorum Christianorum Orientalium* (Louvain, 1960); vol. 2, ed. E. W. Brooks in ibid., (1960); Vol. 3, ed. E. W. Brooks, I. Guidi, and J. B. Chabot in ibid. (1961), or the Arabic translation of the same entitled *al-Tarikh al-Saghir (Chronica Minora),* trans. Rev. Butrus Haddad (Baghdad, 1976), published together with the Syriac text. A contemporary writer reiterates the same fabricated account about Athanasius without investigation. See Harry J. Magoulias, *Byzantine Christianity: Empire, Church and the West* (Chicago, 1970), 36. Another contemporary writer, Aziz Atiya, states that after his successful crusade against the Persians, Emperor Heraclius "visited the site of the Monastery of Marun in 628 to discuss with the monks of this monastery his new idea about mending the rifts in Christendom," but without providing a source. Although the first writer to mention that Emperor Heraclius visited the Monastery of Marun in the year 9 A.H. (630 A.D.), is Saʿid Ibn Batriq, he says nothing about the emperor having discussed with the monks of the monastery his new idea, that is, one will in Christ (Monothelitism) or about mending the rift in Christendom. Obviously, Atiya has confused the meeting of Emperor Heraclius with the Syrian patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius VI (nicknamed Gammala), and his twelve bishops in the city of Mabug to discuss the reconciliation of the churches, with the visit of the emperor to the Monastery of Marun. See Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity,* 395. For Saʿid Ibn Batriq, see *Kitab al-Tarikh al-Majmuʿ ʿala al-Tahqiq wa al-Tasdiq,* ed. L. Cheikho B. Carra De Vaux, and H. Zayyat (Beirut, 1909), 5, in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,* Scriptores Arabici Textus, Series Tertia-Tomus 7.

3. For this letter see Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 3, and p. 403 and Chapter 11, p. 405 of the French translation. In this letter Heraclius maintained that God the Word—Christ—is not subject to suffering, was crucified and suffered in his body and that He is of two natures united without confusion or division in one action in conformity with the formula of the Blessed Cyril, who maintained that after the union of the two natures of Christ we can only profess "One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos." We also deduce from this letter that Heraclius tried to reconcile the formula of faith defined by Chalcedon with Cyril's *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* on the ground that it is not proper to ascribe to the two natures of Christ after their union separate actions as Heraclius maintained "emanated from the Incarnate God the Word." For a further discussion of this letter and a refutation of the allegations of Asad Rustam, and his distorted understanding of it, see Yaʿqub III, *al-Haqa'iq al-Jaliyya,* 69–80.

4. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 3, p. 410, and Chapter 11, p. 412 of the French translation. Bishop Pierre Dib in *History of the Maronite Church,* 10–11, reproduces this same account by Tal Mahri to show that in the seventh century "the Maronites continued to defend the cause of Orthodoxy," meaning the Chalcedonian definition of faith, but fails to produce evidence to substantiate such a claim. Aziz Atiya has confused the facts on this point. He states that Emperor Heraclius visited the Monastery of Marun and won the monks of this monastery over to the new doctrine (one

will in Christ, Monothelitism) of Macedonius. There is no evidence that Heraclius discussed Monothelitism with the monks of the Monastery of Marun in order to win them over to this doctrine. Furthermore, the doctrine of Monothelitism was not that of Macedonius but of Macarius, patriarch of Constantinople. Atiya further states that "the Syrians of Lebanon remained adamant in their Monothelitic profession and gradually segregated themselves from both the orthodox and Jacobite sections of population." Historical fact indicates that Monothelitism as a newly defined theological doctrine emerged in Syria in the time of Emperor Heraclius and spread among the people of several towns in Syria as Dionysius Tal Mahri, our earliest source on this subject, has demonstrated. There was no Monthelitism in Lebanon during the period of time discussed by Atiya. See Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity,* 395.

5. Saʿid Ibn Batriq (Eutychius) *Kitab al-Tarikh al-Majmuʿ ʿala al-Tahqiq wa al-Tasdiq (Annales),* ed. L. Cheikho, (Beirut, 1905), 210 in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,* Scriptores Arabici Textus, Series Tertia-Tomus 6. A Latin translation of the same is in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 111, 1077–1078.

6. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 17.

7. Reverend Mikha'il Abd Allah Gabriel Shababi, *Tarikh al-Kanisa al-Suryaniyya al-Maruniyya (History of the Maronite Syrian Church of Antioch)* 11 (Bʿabda Lebanon, 1900–1906), 423, and Bernard Ghobaira al-Ghaziri, *Rome Et L' Église Syrienne-Maronite D' Antioche 517–1531* (Paris, 1906), 30–48. See also the Arabic summary at the end of the same, pp. 176–78.

8. John Green, *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus* (London, 1736), 118, and Robert W. Crawford, "William of Tyre and the Maronites," *Speculum* (April, 1955), 225–26.

9. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 27, and *Ruh al-Rudud,* 34, 57.

10. Ibid.

11. Severus Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ's *Kitab al-Majamiʿ* ed. P. Chelbi, *Refutation de Saʿid Ibn-Batriq (Eutychius)* (Le Livre des Conciles) in *Patrologia Orientalis,* 111 (1905), 121–242. See also Georg Graf, *Geschichte Der Christlichen,* 306–308.

12. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 216–17.

13. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53–96; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 128–38; and *Muhamat,* ed. Afram al-Dirani, (n.p., 1899), 26–38, 85–94, 144–81, 306–420.

14. Al-Masʿudi, *al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf* (Cairo, 1938), 131–32.

15. Ibid.

16. Robert W. Crawford, "William of Tyre and the Maronites," *Speculum* (April, 1955), 226, seems to be definite that the Monastery of Marun which al-Masʿudi described was the same monastery built after Marun's death in 410.

17. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 82, 92.

5—MARONITE CLAIMS AND SIXTH-CENTURY EPISTOLARY DOCUMENTS

1. All of these letters except the one addressed by monks from Syria Secunda to Pope Hormisda are found in *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, ed. Philip Labbe and Gabriel Cossartii (Paris, 1671), 15–22, 22–38, 100–106, 106–115, 143–51, 151–58, 158–62, 243–51. The letter of the monks from Syria Secunda is found in ibid., vol. 4, 1461–465. For citing this incident by contemporary Maronites see Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 174–77, and Namaan, *Théodoret de Cyr,* 150.

2. Ernest Honigmann, *Évéques Et Évéchés Monophysites D'Asie Anterieure Au VI Siecle* (Louvain, 1951), 58–59.

3. For this letter see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–465; *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et Amplissima Collectio,* ed. G. D. Mansi, (Florence and Venice, 1758–1798), 1023–1029; *Patrologia Latina* 63, ed. J. P. Migne, 410–420; and *Epistulae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum Avellana Quae Dicitur Collectio,* ed. Otto Guenther in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 35 (1898), 11, 565–71.

4. Ibid.

5. For this letter see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 143–51; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1023–1029; and Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 63, 416–22.

6. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 996–1021; Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church* 4, trans. into English by William Clarck (Edinburgh, 1895), 201; Louis Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ al-Khalqayduni fi al-Tarikh" ("Martyrs of the Council of Chalcedon in History"), *al-Mashriq* 22 (1924), 598–603; Lammens, *Tasrih* 1, 118, and 11, 84–85; and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 146–48.

7. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 243–46, and Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1129–136.

8. Ibid.

9. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 250.

10. Honigmann, *Évéques,* 59, and Daww *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 174–77.

11. Honigmann, *Évéques,* 59.

12. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 243.

13. Louis Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ," 598–603, and Lammens, *Tasrih* 1, 118, and 11, 84–85. Another Maronite writer states that the 350 monks were massacred by Emperor Anastases I in 517. See Rev. Peter Eid in Raphael, *Role of the Maronites,* 15.

14. Lammens, *Tasrih* 1, 118, and 11, 84–85.

15. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 111, Chapter 34, p. 374 of the English translation.

16. Ibid., Book 11, Chapters 33 and 34, pp. 372–74 of the English translation.

17. Ibid. See also Honigmann, *Évéques,* 54–58 where he follows Evagrius. Al-Duwayhi provides a rather distorted account of the tension between Severus of Antioch and the bishops under his jurisdiction. See al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 40–41. Asad Rustam appears to be hostile to the same Severus of Antioch and like al-Duwayhi he provides a distorted and prejudicial account concerning the tension between Severus and his bishops. See Asad Rustam, *Kanisat Madinat* 1, 353–60. For a refutation of Rustam's opinions see Yaᶜqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 97–101.

18. For this letter see *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus of Antioch* 11, ed. and trans. into English by E. W. Brooks (London, 1903), Part 1, 84. See also Honigmann, *Évéques,* 59.

19. Honigmann, *Évéques,* 59.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries* (Cambridge, 1972), 228–29.

24. Ibid.

25. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–465.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid. 5, 143–51.

28. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 193–94.

29. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 158–62, and Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1129–136.

30. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 193–94.

31. Ibid.

32. See *The Syriac Chronicle Known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene,* trans. into English by F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks (London, 1899), Book 7, Chapters 8 and 9, pp. 120–24. Cf. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 111, Chapters 12, 14, and 30.

33. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book VII. See also Peter Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1939), 491–518.

34. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 8, Chapter 1, p. 189 of the English translation; Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 4, Chapter 1. A contemporary work on Justin is by A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950).

35. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 8, Chapter 2, pp. 190–91 of the English translation and Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History, Chapter 4.* The persecution inflicted by Justin I on those who rejected the council of Chalcedon and the different reactions to his religious policies see Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* the entire chapter entitled "The Religious Policy of Justin," 132–253, and J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire,* (New York: Dover, n.d.), 372–78.

36. For this synod see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 202–211.

37. Ibid., 2121–15; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1093–1097, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 119. For the letter of the monks from Apamea to the local synod of bishops assembled in Syria Secunda in 518 see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 243–51, and Mansi, ibid., 1097–1136.

38. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 98–106; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 107; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 117–18; and Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* 135–48.

39. See the letter of Severus of Antioch to Bishop Eleusinius in *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus of Antioch* 2, part 11, pp. 36–361; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 117; and Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* 135–36.

40. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 243–51; W. A. Wigram, *The Separation of The Monophysites* (London, 1923), 90–91; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1041; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 117; and Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* 137, who states that "this series of extremely interesting documents on the subject is reproduced among the Acts of the Constantinopolitan Synod of 536 A.D.," but without describing their importance.

41. One should only read *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 1–275 in order to discover and understand the falsehoods and vilifications against Severus of Antioch and his associates, particularly Peter of Apamea, Anthimus, and Zʿura.

42. Our main source in this regard is *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 9, Chapters 15, 16, and 19, pp. 253–61, 265 of the English translation.

43. For this letter of Severus to Justinian see ibid., Book 9, Chapter 16, pp. 252–61 of the English translation.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid., Book 9, Chapters 15 and 19, pp. 265–66 of the English translation.

46. Ibid.

47. Ibid., and Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites,* 115–16.

48. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 193, and Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites,* who repeats the same reasons as Hefele did. Since these two writers do not reveal their source, it is difficult to determine the accuracy of their statements. See also, R. V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon* (London, 1961), 312–21.

49. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 9, Chapter 19, pp. 267–68 of the English translation.

50. Ibid.

51. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 193, and Wigram, *The Separation of the Monophysites,* 116.

52. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 9, Chapter 19. Hefele states that Agapetus died on 6 or 22, 536. See Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 193.

53. For these letters exchanged between the three fathers of the church see *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* entire Book 9, Chapters 21–26. The Syriac copy of these letters was edited and published by Rev. Jean B. Chabot in *Scriptorum Syri Textus,* Series Secunda-Tomus 38, *Documents Ad Origines Monophysitarum Illustranda* (Leipzig, 1907).

6—THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE OF A.D. 536 AND THE LETTER OF THE MONKS OF SYRIA SECUNDA TO POPE HORMISDA

1. See the introduction of E. W. Brooks to *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch* 11, Part 1 of the English translation, 8.

2. Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 194.

3. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 250.

4. Ibid.

5. See the commemoration of the fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church chanted during the mass in lieu of the ancient dyptichs, which contain a praise of Severus of Antioch as the "crown of the Syrians" and "pillar of the whole church of God" in the English translation of *The Divine Liturgy of St. James* (United States: Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, 1967), 46.

6. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina* 165–182, and W. H. C. Frend, "Christianity in the Middle East: Survey down to A.D. 1800," in *Religion In The Middle East* 1, ed. A. J. Arberry, (Cambridge, 1969), 246–47.

7. For this letter see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 143–51; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1093–1136 and Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 201–203.

8. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 151–58.

9. For this letter see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–465; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 425–29; and Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 63, 410–411.

10. See the postscript of the letter of the monks to the synod of 518 in *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 250.

11. See the letter of Peter, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, to the bishop of Aquileia, in which he states that the bishop of Rome should be called pope; the bishop of Constantinople, archpriest; and the bishop of Antioch should be exclusively called a patriarch, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 120, 757.

12. See the letter of the bishops of Syria Secunda to this John in *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 158–62; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1093, cf. Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 119.

13. For the rejection of Pope Leo I of this title see Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 111, 429.

14. This is Letter No. 8 of Pope Pelagius II found in *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 949.

15. Ibid., 5, 995–96.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., 5, 1181–182. This letter is entitled "Concerning Bishop John of Constantinople who arrogated for himself the title universal."

18. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–462; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 445–49; and *Patrologia Latina* 63, 410.

19. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–465; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 425–29; and *Patrologia Latina* 63, 410.

20. For more information on whether Saint Peter founded a church in Antioch and was its first bishop, see *Excursus* 3, entitled "Peter in Antioch," in Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton, N.J.: University Press, 1961), 585. The Excursus covers pp. 583–86.

21. See Letter No. 24 of Pope Innocent I to Alexander, patriarch of Antioch in *Patrologia Latina* 20, 547–51. For more information on this subject see B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461,* 111 (Oxford University Press, 1922), 175–76.

22. See the calendar of the Church of Rome at the end of the Syriac *Ishhim (Book of Daily Prayers for the Whole Week)* published in Rome, 1853.

23. William Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity* (London, 1864; reprinted, Amsterdam Oriental Press, 1967), 33 and the footnote on p. 172. For evidence confirming the tradition of the Church of Antioch that Saint Peter was the founder and first bishop of the See of Antioch, see Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 87–89.

24. For the claim of Maronites that these monks were from the Monastery of Marun see Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaʿ, 599, where Butrus Makhluf and Germanos Farhat are cited. See also Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 165–72.

25. See the encyclical of the late Maronite Patriarch Bulus al-Maʿushi in *al-Sanabil* (April, 1963), 225, quoted by Yaʿqub III in *Nafh al-Abir,* 87, footnote 2.

26. See the letters of Pope Leo I, No. 104 to the Emperor Marcian, No. 105 to Pulcheria the emperor's wife and No. 106 to Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church,* 12, 11 series, ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (1895), 74–79. See also Hefele, *History of the Councils* 3, 433–38.

27. Ibid.

28. Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* 160–90.

29. Peter Charanis, *Church and State,* 72–73. For a detailed account of the *Libellus* (a confession of faith) see Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 120–23 and Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* 160–90.

30. Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* Chapter 4, "The Religious Policy of Justin," especially pp. 146–90.

31. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–464; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 425–29; and Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 58, 410.

32. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 4, Chapters 10 and 11, and *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 9, Chapter 15, p. 253, together with footnotes 2 and 3 of the English translation.

33. For this edict see Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 4, Chapter 2; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1049; Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 86, 1095–104; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 203–204.

34. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 4, Chapters 24 and 29, and Book 6, Chapter 7.

35. Ibid., Book 3, Chapters 34, and Book 4, Chapter 7.

36. Ibid., Book 3, Chapter 33.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid., Book 3, Chapter 33.

39. Ibid., and Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 512 and footnote 40, in which he refers to Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 3, Chapter 33, in *Patrologia Graeca* 86, 2669B.

40. See Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni's edition of al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 52, footnote 1, where he calls Assemani "Sultan al-Ulama" (Sultan of learned men).

41. See Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 100–101.

42. Ibid., p. 100.

43. See al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 38–43. Al-Duwayhi does not reveal his source, but since he studied in Rome the author assumes that he must have had access to the *Sacrosancta Concilia* edited by Labbe and Cossartii. See also, John Green, *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus,* 116, and footnote 1. The author derives his information mainly from the works of Faustus Nairon.

44. See Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* 4, with notes by the Rev. H. H. Hilman (Philadelphia, n.d.), 162, and *ibid.,* 8, ed. J. B. Bury (New York: Fred De Fau, 1907), 194–95 with footnote 129 on p. 195, where Bury cites Baronius, A.D. 513, No. 7.

45. Ibid., especially footnote 126 added by Rev. Hilman, and footnote 129 of Bury's edition where Bury refers us to Baronius.

46. See Ernest Honigmann, *Évêques,* 59–61; Robert W. Crawford, "William of Tyre," 226, where the author refers to Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 425–29; W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement,* 229; and Francis Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958), 127–28.

7—THE MARONITES AND SAINT SIMON THE STYLITE

1. Charles C. Torrey, "The Letters of Simeon the Stylite," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 20 (1899), 268–70.

2. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book Z, Chapter 10, and Torrey, "Letters of Simon," 258.

3. Torrey, "Letters of Simon," 260–64.

4. Ibid., 267.

5. For this superscription see ibid.

6. See Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 8, Chapter 12, p. 218, and 11, 92 of the French translation.

7. This Syriac biography, most likely unknown to Western scholars, comprises ninety-eight pages of medium size and was transcribed in the fourteenth century. At present it is at the Library of the Patriarchate of the Syrian Orthodox Church in Damascus, Syria. Cf. Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 92, footnote I.

8. Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 222, 249.

9. This episode is found in the Syriac MS in the Library of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus. See Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 93–94.

10. Ibid.

11. See appendix 12 to Dawud's *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 516, which contains the Syriac version of this prayer.

12. Ibid., 389–414.

13. See *Missale Chaldiacum Iuxta ritum Ecclesiae nationis Maronitarum* (Rome, 1594).

14. See this letter in *The Sixth Book of Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch* 1, Part 1, 134–37, and Part 11, 120–23.

15. For this homily of Severus see British Museum Syriac MS. Add. 12, 159, fols. 47a-51b.

16. See *The Book of Life* appended to *Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy,* trans. into English by R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington (London, 1913), 125, where Simon the Stylite is listed among the orthodox teachers, solitaries, and ascetics of the Syrian Church.

17. Paul Bedjan, *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum,* 250–65. On the propitiary prayers of Yeshue of Basibrina, see Ignatius Afram Barsoum, *al-Luʾlu al-Manthur fi Tarikh al-Ulum wa al-Adab al-Suryaniyya (Unstrung Pearls in the History of Syriac Sciences and Literatures),* 2nd ed. (Aleppo, 1956), 559. An English translation of this book has been made by the present author, but it is still in manuscript form.

18. See Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 6, p. 417, and 11, 422 of the French translation.

19. Ibid.

20. Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* 96–97.

21. For the fifth canon of the Lateran Council assembled in 649, see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 351; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 10, 1150; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 110.

8—PETER THE FULLER AND THE TRISAGION DISPUTE

1. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1461–465; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 426–27; Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 63, 411.

2. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 3, 451–52, Msgr. Louis Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church From its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century* 3, trans. into English by Claude Jenkins (London, 1960), 352; B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 641* 3 (Oxford, 1922), 409, footnote 3; Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch,* 485–86, Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement,* 168; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 36, where he refers to the addition to the Trisagion as a "heresy"; and W. K. Prentice, "Fragments of an Early Christian Liturgy in Syrian Inscription," *Transactions of American Philological Association* 33 (1902), 82–83, in which the author arbitrarily labels Peter the Fuller as a heretic but also quotes Theodore Lector's *Ecclesiastical History* 1, 20, who accused the Fuller of bribing some people in Antioch to accept the phrase he allegedly added to the Trisagion.

3. Photius, *Bibliotheca* in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 103, 958; Yusuf Deryan, *Lubab,* 97, footnote 1, who unjustifiably accuses Peter the Fuller of being a Theopaschite; and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 30–31.

4. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 7, Chapters 7 and 9, pp. 169 and 178 of the English translation.

5. Ibid.

6. Addai Cher, *Tarikh Kaldo wa Athur* 11 (Beirut, 1912–1913), 135.

7. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 36.

8. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 100, footnote 1.

9. Ibid., 101.

10. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 84–85.

11. For the account of Ephraim of Amida see Photius, *Bibliotheca,* in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 103, 958; al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 84–85; Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 96–107, where the author reproduces the same argument; and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 30–31.

12. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 3, Chapter 44; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 450; and Kidd, *History of the Church,* 409. Cf. Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* 3, Book 9, Chapter 7.

13. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 85.

14. Ibid.

15. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 451. See also Kidd, *History of the Church,* 409, and Deryan, *Lubab,* 97–99.

16. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 451–52.

17. Ibid.

18. For Eutyches's statement of faith see portions of the minutes of the synod convened by Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople in 488, to examine Eutyches's belief reproduced in the transactions of *The Second Synod of Ephesus,* trans. into English by Samuel G. F. Perry (Kent, 1881), p. 423. According to Zachariah of Mitylene, Eutyches maintained that the Word became flesh as "the atmosphere assumes bodily form and becomes rain or snow under the influence of the wind, or as water by reason of the cold air becomes ice." *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 11, Chapter 2, pp. 20–21 of the English translation.

19. "A Treatise of Barsalibi Against the Melchites," trans. into English by A. Mingana, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 11 (Woodbrooke Studies, 1927), 167, in which Bar Salibi states that this Trisagion refers to the Son to whom it is appropriate and that it is known by the following: "we say Holy art Thou O God the Son, because He became flesh although remaining God; and we say: Holy art Thou O Omnipotent, because He put on our weak body although remaining omnipotent in His divinity; and we say: Holy art Thou O Immortal, because He died in the flesh although remaining immortal like God."

20. The Trisagion with this presumabley addition to it could be better explained in the light of the theology of Severus of Antioch. See Roberta C. Chesnut, *Three Monophysite Christologies* (Oxford University Press, 1976), 17, footnote 1. See also Gregorius Jirjis Shahin, *Nahj Wasim fi Tarikh al-Umma al-Suryaniyya al-Qawim* (Sabra Press, 1911), 23, and Severus Yaʿqub Tuma (later Ignatius Yaʿqub III, patriarch of Antioch), *Tarikh al-Kanisa al-Suryaniyya al-Antakiyya (A History of the Syrian Church of Antioch)* 2 (Beirut, 1957), 226–

9—SIGNATORIES TO THE LETTER OF THE MONKS TO POPE HORMISDA AND RELATED DOCUMENTS FROM THE COUNCIL

1. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1463–465; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 427–29; Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 68, 411–14.

2. See for example the letters addressed by the Syrian Orthodox bishops to the

clergy and people of Arabia and the reply of the abbots of Arabia to the Orthodox bishops in the British Museum Syriac MS Add. 14, 602, in which every signatory signs his name and designates his monastery and its location. A reference to this MS is found in William Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in The British Museum* 2 (London, 1871), 709–714. Cf. Arthur Adolphe Vaschalde, *Three Letters of Philoxenus Bishop of Mabough* (485–519) (Rome, 1902), 52, footnote 1.

3. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 29–30.

4. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 174–82.

5. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 246–47; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1093–136; and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 173–77.

6. See the letter of Pope Hormisda to the monks of Syria Secunda, presumed by some writers to be a response to the letter of these monks to the pope in *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 143–51; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1023–1029; and Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 63, 416–20.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid. Maronite writers produce an Arabic translation of this letter. See al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 44; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 22; and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 172–73.

9. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 143–51; Mansi, *Sacrorum Coniliorum* 8, 877; and Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 194–95.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 192–93 produces an Arabic summary of this letter with the signatures of the delegates.

12. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 192–93. Dib's claim that Paul represented the Monastery of Marun at the Council of Constantinople (536), is historically groundless. See Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 5.

13. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book III, Chapter 33.

14. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 7, Chapter 10.

15. Ibid.

16. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 91.

17. For this letter see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 22–38; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 896–902; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 196. Arabic excerpts of the same are in Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 188–89.

18. Ibid.

19. See *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 31, where the signature of this Theodore appears as follows, "Theodorus presbyter archimandrita monasterii Maroni in sicubus," A marginal note indicates that "sicubus" is "Sycis." See also Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 911, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 196.

20. For this memorial see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 155–30; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 984–96; and Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 200.

21. For this memorial see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 106–115; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 984–96; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 195.

22. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 119.

23. Ibid., 142.

24. Ibid., 199; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 996; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 200.

10—THE MARONITES AND THE LETTERS OF THE MONKS FROM SYRIA SECUNDA

1. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 203. Hefele does not seem to accept the accusations against Severus. He states, "Of Severus it was alleged, in an astonishing manner, that he sometimes defended the Nestorian and sometimes the Eutychian error, though they were as far as possible opposed." A Maronite writer falsely calls Severus "the intruder, bloody patriarch." See Paul Abraham, *Maronites of Lebanon,* 33. Other Maronite writers like al-Duwayhi and Daww are not wanting in repeating similar crimes against Severus.

2. W. K. Prentice, "Fragments of an Early Christian Liturgy," 84–85. Cf. Constantius, patriarch of Constantinople, *The Patriarchs of Antioch,* in John Mason Neale, *A History of the Holy Eastern Church: The Patriarchate of Antioch* (Rivingtons: London, 1873), 163–64. Walter F. Adeney may seem to be objective in regard to the accusations against Severus of Antioch by stating that one should be cautious in accepting the testimonies of bitter foes, yet, he unjustifiably and even without providing a source, states "it is difficult to resist the conclusion that this Monophysite Patriarch (Severus) was a man of blood." See Walter F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908), 115.

3. Gustave Bardy, *The Greek Literature of the Early Christian Church,* trans. Mother Mary Reginald, (London, 1929), 178–79. Other writers who have studied the life and works of Severus of Antioch never mentioned a derogatory word about him. See Joseph Lebon, *Le Monophysime Sévérien Études Historique, Littéraire Et Théologique Sur La résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcédoine jusqua' a' la Constitution de l' Église* (Louvain, 1909), and Roberta Chesnut, *Three Monophysite Christologies.*

4. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement,* 201.

5. Ibid., 241.

6. On the Monastery of Mar Basus see Rev. Jean B. Chabot, *La Légende de St. Bassus et son couvent à Apamée* (Paris, 1893).

7. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 39–40; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 20–24; Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ," 599; and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 63. See also *The Maronite Rite A Catechism,* ed. Msgr. Joseph Abi Nader (United States: Maronite Apostolic Exarchate, 1972), 7, which states that "In 517, A.D., 350 Maronite monks were martyred defending its (the Council of Chalcedon) decrees."

8. See *Martyrology Romani* (Rome, 1845), 143, which states that "in Syria sanctorum trecentorum quinqua aginta," and Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ," 598–99.

9. Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ," 601.

10. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 8, 1024–1030, and Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 63, 410–14. Cf. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 4, 1463–465.

11. Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ," 601.

12. *Martyrology Romani,* 143.

13. Cheikho, "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ," 599.

14. British Museum Syriac MS Add, 12, 155, col. 163–64, and William Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts* 2, 945.

15. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts* 2, 921.

16. The Reverend F. Nau published these materials in *Le Bulletin de l' Association de Saint-Louis des Maronites* (Paris, 1903), 343–50, 367–81.

17. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 26–33. For another Arabic translation of the Syriac text see Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 65–86. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 199–201 reproduces portions of al-Dibs's Arabic translation.

18. Nau, *Le Bulletin,* 343–50.

19. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book X, Chapter 21, pp. 379–80, and 11, 361 of the French translation. Cf. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 2, 462, where the author reproduces Stephen's assertion that "the previous Monophysitism is a half measure, for if only one nature is admitted, then there could be no longer any distinction between the divine and the human in Christ." See also Adrian Fortescue, *The Lesser Eastern Churches* (London, 1913), 208.

20. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book X, Chapter 21, p. 382, and 11, 364 of the French translation.

21. G. Tchalenko, *Villages Antiques de la Syrie du Nord* 3 (Paris, 1958) 86–94.

22. For Nau see above note 16. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 63–64, emphatically states that this correspondence is a "decisive proof" that the monks of the Monastery of Marun were Chalcedonians. See also Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 9–10; he iterates Nau's argument.

23. See below the lengthy quotation from Tal Mahri regarding the argument between the Maronites and the followers of Maximus at the end of Chapter 12.

24. Bernard Chobaira al-Ghaziri, *Rome Et L'Église Syrienne-Maronite D' Antioche* (517–1531), 13–27.

11—WERE THE MONKS OF THE MONASTERY OF MARUN CHALCEDONIANS?

1. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 71. For the rejection of the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon as an innovation and violation of the faith instituted by the Council of Nicea, see *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 9, Chapter 15, p. 252 of the English translation.

2. For this formula of faith by Saint Cyril, see his letter to Succensum Episcopum in *Patrologia Graeca* 77, 232, and 76, 60; Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon,* 154, and by the same author, *Two Ancient Christologies,* 80–106. It should be noticed, however, that the formula "One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos" is found in *ad Jovianum* by the celebrated Saint Athanasius of Alexandria although some writers claim that, in all probability, this formula belongs to Apollinaris of Laodicea. See H. Lietzmann, *Apollinaris Von Laodicea und seine schule* (Tübingen, 1904), 281, and Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies,* 54, footnote 3. For a strong argument that the words *One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos* were genuinely those of Saint Athanasius see the preface of E. B. Pusey to Saint Cyril of Alexandria, *On the Incarnation Against Nestorius* (Oxford, 1881), 33–36. Indeed, this whole work by Saint Cyril is designed to show the oneness of the *Incarnate Nature of the Word* after the union (see p. 41 of the text together with footnote 1.) For an explanation of these words of Saint Cyril see Severus of Antioch, *Le Philalèthes* (Syriac text), ed. Robert Hespel (Louvain, 1951), 139. See also by the same Severus of Antioch his letter to Eupraxius the Chamberlain in *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch,* ed. and trans. into English by E. W. Brooks, *Patrologia Orientalis* 14, 28–29.

3. Reverend Siméon Vailhé, "L' Église Maronite Du V' Au 1X Siècle," *Échos D' Orient* 9 (Paris, 1906), 261.

4. Vailhé, Ibid. For an account of the persecution of the monks of the Monastery of Marun by Theophilact Ibn Qanbara, see Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 22, p. 457, and 11, 511 of the French translation.

5. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 22, p. 467, and 11, 511 of the French translation.

6. See, for example, the authorities cited by John Lawrence Von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History* 1, trans. by James Murdock, 457–58, footnote 24, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* which contains exhaustive evidence of the "heresy" of the Maronites.

7. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 3, p. 140, and 11, 402 of the French translation and Bar Hebraeus, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 111, Chapter 2. See Matti Moosa, "The Relation of the Maronites of Lebanon to the Mardaites and al-Jarajima," *Speculum* 44 (October, 1969), 606.

8. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 100–101.

9. Ibid., entire Chapter 5.

10. See Migne, *Patrolgoai Graeca,* 98, 82.

11. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 12.

12—HERACLIUS AND THE MONTHELITIC FORMULA OF FAITH

1. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 11.

2. Theophanes, *Chronographia,* A.M. 6113, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 633–39, and Hitti, *History of Syria,* 499.

3. Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma* 4, trans. into English by Neil Buchanan (New York: Dover, n.d.), 254.

4. See *The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite,* trans. Rev. John Parker, (New York: Richwood Publishing Co., 1976), Part I, Letter No. 4, addressed to Gaius Therapeutes, pp. 143–44. This is a reprint of the original of 1897–1899.

5. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 9, Chapter 15, pp. 250–51 of the English translation.

6. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 6, quoting Maximus *OPP.* 1, ed. Combefis, 52 states that the words of Cyril were interpolated by the anti-Chalcedonian Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, nicknamed by his enemies as the "cat" or "weasel." Cyril's statement is genuine and in conformity with his theological doctrine—*One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos.* If the outcome of the Incarnation of God the Word is one nature, it would be logical that the same Incarnate God the Word should have also one energy and one will.

7. Pope Vigilius arrived in Constantinople on January 25, 547, invited by Justinian in connection with the controversy of *The Three Chapters.* It was then that he wrote a letter to the emperor condemning *The Three Chapters* and stating his belief in One Energy in Christ. See *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 328–34, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 250. When the letters of Pope Vigilius were read at the seventh session of the Fifth Council and the third session of the Sixth Council, the papal legates questioned their authenticity. Hefele is not sure whether these letters are spurious and states that they were probably genuine. However, he maintains that they were interpolated and that the words *unam operationem* were inserted by Monothelites. The author cannot agree with Hefele on this point since there is nothing in the original to indicate that the words *unam operationem* were interpolated by Monthelites. See *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 619–25, particularly p. 632.

8. This came up in the thirteenth session of the Sixth Council. See *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 940–57. See also Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 9, 555; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 6; and Theophanes, *Chronographia,* A. M. 6121, in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 678–83. Modern writers who maintain that Sergius was a "Jacobite" or "Monophysite" have not documented this point. See Hitti, *History of Syria,* 417, and Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement,* 344.

9. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 4, footnote 1, and Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma,* 245–55 of the English translation.

10. Von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History,* 451–52, especially p. 452, footnote 6. The authors cited are Chalcedonians. The earliest account of the meeting of the Syrian Patriarch Athanasius with Heraclius contains no such suggestion by the patriarch.

11. See this quotation in Alphonse M. Liguori, *The History of Heresies and Their Refutation* 1, trans. into English by Rev. John T. Mullock (Dublin, 1874), 190. Hefele, who refers to this meeting does not hesitate to display his prejudice against this saintly patriarch, whom he calls a "sly Syrian" See Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 16. See also Asad Rustam, *Kanisat Madinat,* 435–36, quoting the *Chronica Minora* as his source on this deal between the patriarch and Heraclius. For a refutation of Rustam's opinion see Yaʿqub III, *al-Haqa'iq al-Jaliyya,* 62–69. See above Chapter 4, note 2.

12. Liguori, *The History of Heresies,* 190.

13. For this letter see Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 1, pp. 403–404, and 11, 402 of the French translation.

14. The affair of Pope Honorius has been extensively discussed by Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 27–69, 178–205. For this affair and the condemnation of Honorius by the Sixth Council see below Chapter 20.

15. See below Chapter 20; *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 10, 691; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 21–22, 41–49, 137–205. Those who are interested further in this subject should check the acts of the Sixth Council in the *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 537–1220.

16. Tal Mahri treats the doctrine of two wills in Christ thoroughly and calls it "the heresy of Maximus." See Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapters 11 and 12, pp. 431–34, and 11, 433–35, 446–48, 451–54 of the French translation. Cf. Theophanes, *Chronographia,* A. M. 6121 in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 678–83; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 11, 1–12, 74; and Harnack, *History of Dogma,* 262 of the English translation.

17. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 17, p. 452, and 11, 479 of the French translation.

18. Ibid., Book 11, Chapter 3, p. 410, and 11, 412 of the French translation. For an analysis of the reasons which prompted Patriarch Athanasius and the bishops in his company to reject Heraclius's formula of faith, see Yaʿqub III, *al-Haqa'iq al-Jaliyya,* 62–69.

19. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 3, p. 410, and 11, 412 of the French translation.

20. Ibid. Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 69–101.

21. Bishop Yusuf Deryan strove hard to prove that Monothelitism never entered Syria in the seventh century by producing evidence which the author finds unconvincing. See Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 123–39.

22. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 20, pp. 457–60, and 11, 492–94 of the French translation.

23. Ibid., p. 460, and 11, 494 of the French translation.

24. Ibid., pp. 460–61, and 11, 494–96 of the French translation.

13—THE MALKITES, THE MARONITES, AND THE SIXTH COUNCIL

1. On the Sixth Council and the condemnation of Monothelitism see above Chapter 12, note 14.

2. Bishop Yusuf Deryan contests the account of Tal Mahri on the basis that prior to the year 727 there was no dispute among the Chalcedonians in Syria over dogma, especially Monothelitism, because the decisions of the Sixth Council had been published in Syria. In fact, Monothelitism was known in Syria since Heraclius issued his *Ecthesis* in 638. See Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 145–47.

3. The literature on this issue is exhaustive. For a short but illuminating discussion of both sides of this issue see "Unofficial Consultation between Theologians of Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches August 11–15, 1964: Papers and Minutes," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10, no. 2 (Winter, 1964–1964). As far as the author can ascertain this was the first attempt in modern times of both Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian theologians to remove obstacles and achieve understanding of the opinions of each other.

4. Frederick Loofs, *Nestorius and His Place in the History of Christian Dogma* (Cambridge, 1913), 6. For a detailed discussion of this point see Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies,* 86–106, 143–201.

5. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 149–55, especially p. 150, footnote 1. Bishop Pierre Dib, basing his argument on the same account of Tal Mahri, reasons that without knowing about the Sixth Council "the Maronites were really in conformity with it." It is the conviction of this author that Dib's reasoning does great violence to Tal Mahri's account. See Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 19–20.

6. Kamal S. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," in *al-Nahar* Dossier, no. 40 (January 5, 1971), 11.

7. Ibid. Cf. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 15–41, where the author produces unconvincing argument to absolve the Maronites from Monothelitism.

8. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 11.

9. Salibi, Ibid.

10. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 151, footnote 1.

11. There is no doubt that the faith defined by the Council of Chalcedon is a modified version of the teaching of Nestorius. Consult Nestorius, *La livre d' Héraclides de Damas* (Syriac text), ed. Paul Bedjan (Paris-Leipzig, 1900), 464, 474, 514, 519, where Nestorius states that he has read Leo's *Tome* and believed that it taught the truth and that Leo's opinions were the same as his. For English and French translations of this work see Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heracleides,* trans. into English by G. R. Driver and Leonard Hodgson, (Oxford, 1925), and *La Livre d' Héraclide,* trans. into French by F. Nau, (Paris, 1910). The definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon based on Leo's *Tome* was so identical with the Christology of the Antiochenes to whom Nestorius belonged that Loofs could remark, "If Nestorius had lived in the time of the Council of Chalcedon, he would have become a pillar of orthodoxy." See Loofs, *Nestorius,* 21. Cf. Karekin Sarkissian, *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church* (New York: The Armenian Church Prelacy, 1975), 55–60.

12. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 20, pp. 457–460, and 11, 492–94 of the French translation.

13. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1005–1008; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 11, 617–18, Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 172–73; and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 123.

14—ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MARONITES AS A SEPARATE CHURCH

1. For the manuscripts of these *Treatises* see above Chapter 1, note 1. Maronite writers disagree on the true identity of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab. Bishop Jabra'il al-Qilaʿi is

of the opinion that Tuma was not Maronite but a "Jacobite" bishop, who was born in Harran, raised in Mardin (in present-day Turkey), was expelled from this city, and went to Lebanon. In Lebanon, Tuma pretended that he was a believer in the doctrine of two wills in Christ in order to deceive the Maronites and teach them the doctrine of one will in Christ (Monothelitism). Istefan al-Duwayhi, who reproduced this account by al-Qilaʿi, admits that Tuma was a Maronite bishop of Kfartab, although he qualified his admission by stating that Tuma was misled by the account of Saʿid Ibn Batriq (Eutychius) about the Maronites. See al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 337–40.

2. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 252–53, and al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 104.

3. For the "Fourth Treatise" see Vatican MS 146, p. 146, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 162.

4. Ibid.

5. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1009. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud in *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 78–79, argues that Eastern writers, including those who wrote in Arabic, have distorted and confused names. He gives evidence of such distortion. However, the present writer believes that a learned man like Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, could not have been ignorant of the time Monothelitism emerged and was condemned as a heresy. Assemani in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 508, denies the veracity of the account of Tuma of Kfartab and affirms that there was no emperor named Marcian during whose reign Monothelitism emerged as a distinct doctrine.

6. Vatican Garshuni MS 146, pp. 146–47, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 263–67.

7. Mansi, *Sacrorum Consiliorum* 10, 691, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 73.

8. Vatican MS 146, p. 146, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 263–65. Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 71–74.

9. Vatican MS 146, pp. 140–42, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 282–83. For evidence that Jacob of Sarug was not Chalcedonian but Syrian Orthodox "Monophysite," see the letter Jacob wrote to the monks of the Monastery of Mar Basus in which he stated "I anathematize also those who after the union divide, confess and count in one Christ two natures with their properties, attributes and operations, so as to give God what is God's and to man what is man's." This letter was translated by Abbé Martin into French and published with other letters of Jacob of Sarug. See P. Martin, "Correspondance de Jacque de Saroug les moines du Convent de Mar Bassus," *ZDMG* 30 (1876), 217–75. Vaschalde reproduces the above quotation and affirms that these letters "prove beyond all reasonable doubt that Jacob of Sarug was a Monophysite." See Adolphe Vaschalde, *Three Letters of Philoxenus Bishop of Mabough* 485–519 (Rome, 1902), 52, footnote 3. For an edition of the letters of Jacob of Sarug see *Iacobi Sarugensis Epistolae quotquot supersunt,* ed. G. Olinder (Louvain, 1952), in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 116. For a refutation of the allegation of the Syrian Catholic Rev. Ishaq Armala that Jacob of Sarug was Chalcedonian see J. Van Der Ploeg, "Isaac Armala, Mar Jaʿcub usquf Sarug al-Malfan, bahth intiqadi, tarikhi, dini," (Jounie, Lebanon, 1946), in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 5, no. 5 (September, 1948), 153–56. For another refutation of the same allegation of Armala see Rev. Bulus Behnam (later Archbishop of Iraq), *Khama'il al-Rihan aw Orthodoxiyyat Mar Yaʿqub al-Sarugi al-Malfan* (Mosul: al-Ittihad Press, n.d). The author has appended thirty-eight pages of Syriac quotations from different writings of Jacob of Sarug to prove that he was of orthodox, that is non-Chalcedonian faith. See also Ignatius Yaʿqub III, *Hibat al-Iman aw al-Malfan Mar Yaʿqub al-Sarugi Usquf Batnan* (Damascus, 1971). In his *Geschichte Der Syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, 1922), 148–58, Anton Baumstark speaks of Jacob

of Sarug as a Monophysite and discusses him under "Literature of the Monophysite Movement." See also Roberta Chesnut, *Three Monophysite Christologies,* 6, footnote 2.

10. See above note 1 of this chapter.

11. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 22, p. 476, and 11, 511 of the French translation.

12. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis Canonici et Civilis* 5 (Rome, 1762), 500.

13. Asad Rustam, *Kanisat Madinat,* 11, 63. Rustam states, but without evidence, that the "Jacobites" instigated the Umayyad caliphs against the Malkites on the premise that the Malkites were allies of the Byzantine emperors. The accusations of these "Jacobites" ultimately turned the caliphs against the Malkites and never permitted them to have a patriarch of their own.

14. Theophanes, *Chronographia,* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 838–43.

15. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 22, p. 464, and 11, 506 of the French translation; Sa'id Ibn Batriq, *Kitab al-Tarikh,* 210. For a Latin translation of the same see *Patrologia Graeca* 111, 1077–1078, and Ishaq Armala, "al-Malikiyyun, Batrakiyyatuhum al-Antakiyya wa Lughatuhum al-Wataniyya wa al-Taqsiyya," *(The Malkites, Their Antiochian Patriarchate and Their National and Ritualistic Language), al-Mashriq* 34 (1936), 215.

16. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 22, p. 467, and 11, 511 of the French translation.

17. Theophanes, *Chronographia,* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 847–50.

18. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 157–58.

19. Antione Daww al-Antoni, "Tarikh al-Patriarchiyya al-Antakiyya al-Maruniyya," *al-Mashriq* 61 (1967), 400–401.

20. Dawud, *Kitab Jami' al-Hujaj,* 108–109, and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris* 500.

21. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 162–63. Deryan arbitrarily makes Andrew a bishop of Mabug while Tal Mahri says nothing about Andrews becoming a bishop. See also Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 343–58, who maintains the same opinion of Deryan.

22. See the biography of Dionysius Tal Mahri in Barsoum, *al-Lu'lu al-Manthur,* 422. Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jami' al-Hujaj,* 110.

23. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 343–46. Daww quotes *Chronicon ad 846 Pertinens,* ed E. W. Brooks, entrepretatus est Chabot, *Auctorum monacum Qartaminsen fuisse e variis notulis conjectare licet,* in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,* 4. What the anonymous author is saying in reality is that Philippicus became emperor for only one and a half years. When he intended to convene a council to confirm the heresey of the Maronites the Byzantine people revolted against him, blinded him, and installed Anastasius in his place. Obviously, this statement has nothing to do with the emergence of the Maronites as a separate church and hierarchy. Cf. al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 269–70, and the refutation of his claim by Dawud, *Kitab Jami' al-Hujaj,* 113–15, where Dawud quotes Bar Hebraeus, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 11, Chapter 17. Daww produces the same quotation from the anonymous chronicle of the monks from the Monastery of Qartmin which has been quoted by Bar Hebraeus. By quoting this chronicle, Daww attempts to show that this episode is connected with the intention of Emperor Philippicus to confirm Monothelitism but not in relation to the installation of a Maronite patriarch.

24. Bar Hebraeus, *Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Duwal (Compendium History of Dynasties)* ed. Rev. Anton Salhani, 2nd. ed. (Beirut, 1958), 127.

15—WHO IS JOHN MARUN?

1. For the book of *al-Huda* see Vatican Syriac MS 133. The reference is to fol. 25 of the same.

2. Vatican Garsuni and Syriac MS 146, p. 1, and Dayr al-Kraym Garshuni MS 31, p. 1.

3. Vatican MS 146, p. 1.

4. This book by al-Qilaʿi entitled *Marun al-Tubani (Blessed Marun),* is found in a unique Garshuni Vatican MS 640. The story of Marun appears on pp. 168–69 of the same. For al-Qilaʿi's account of John Marun see al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53–66. Assemani reproduces this same account about John Marun in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 496–501. Obviously, Assemani has copied a historically groundless story about John Marun which was translated into Latin by Francisco Quaresmio in 1634. See Francisco Quaresmio, *Historica, Theologia Et Moralis Terrae Santae Elucidatio,* 1st. ed. (Antwerp, 1634–1639), 96, and Vol. 1, pp. 72–73 of the second edition of the same (Venice, 1880).

5. See Vatican MS 640, pp. 168–69, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 78–83. Philip Hitti's statement that "Yuhanna Marun was the hero and founder of the new nation (Maronite) cradled on the bank of the Qadisha and in the shade of the cedars," is historically groundless. See Philip Hitti, *Lebanon in History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1957), 249. Likewise, Aziz Atiya's statement that "John Marun of the seventh and eighth centuries was the real apostle of the Maronite Church and the founder of national and ecclesiastical Maronitism," is historically groundless. See Atiya, *History of Eastern Christianity,* 395–96.

6. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53, 66.

7. Ibid., 61, 63. This preposterous story was also related by Tannus al-Shidyaq in his *Akhbar al-Aʿyan fi Jabal Lebnan* (Beirut, 1859), 35. The Syrian Catholic Bishop Gregorius Jirjis Shahin in *Nahj Wasim fi Tarikh al-Umma al-Suryaniyya al-Qawim* (Sabra Press, 1911), 160–62 dismisses al-Shidyaq's story as sheer fabrication. For the same story of John Marun see Yuhanna Badhinjana, *Mir'at al-Haqq al-Wadiyya fi Sharaf al-Milla al-Maruniyya,* in Bibliothèque Orientale Université St. Joseph, Beirut, Arabic MS 785, pp. 35–36. Cf. al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 48–49, and Joseph al-Dahdah, *The Geography of Syria Followed by the History of the Original Maronite Church* (Sydney, Australia, 1899), 29–30.

8. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 62. This quotation is taken from a maymar (discourse) on *The Faith of the Syrian Church,* which al-Duwayhi calls "The Doctrine of the Jacobites." The copy used here is Garshuni MS 25, p. 58, at the Library of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus, Syria. This maymar was translated into Arabic and transcribed by Abd al-Ghani, brother of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarch Pilate (d. 1597). The manuscript was completed in the year 1914 of the Greeks (1602 A.D.). Comparing this MS with the Vatican Arabic MS 74, this author believes that the two MSS contain many identical treatises which have been compiled by the Syrian Orthodox writer Musa Ibn Atsha al-Hadathi of Lebanon. However, the quotation under discussion does not appear in Vatican Arabic MS 74.

9. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 66, 75–76.

10. Ibid., 53–54.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., 56, together with the footnote which is carried from the previous page.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., 56–57 together with the footnote.

15. Ibid., 65.
16. Ibid., 64, 88.
17. Jacques de Vitry, *The History of Jerusalem,* 82, and Assemani, *Italicae Historiae Scriptores* 11, 93.
18. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 131.
19. Assemani, *Italicae Historiae Scriptores* 11, 93–94.
20. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 131.
21. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53, 65–66. Evagrius mentions a patriarch named John of Seremis who succeeded Eutychius to the patriarchal throne of Constantinople. See Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 4, Chapters 38 and 39.
22. Al-Dwuayhi, *Tarikh,* 51.
23. Ibid., 51–52. For this quotation see Patriarchate of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Damascus MS. 25, p. 58. See above note 8.
24. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 52.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid. For the persecution inflicted by John of Serum on the anti-Chalcedonians see John of Asia (Ephesus), *Ecclesiastical History,* ed. William Cureton (Oxford, 1853), Book 1, Chapters 1 and 4, Book 11, Chapters 2 and 26, and Book 111, Chapters 12–13. See also the English translation of this work entitled *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus,* trans. into English by R. Payne Smith (Oxford, 1860), 1–22, 72–74, 82, 132, 187. Michael the Great has incorporated most of John of Ephesus's account of the same persecution in his *Chronicle,* Book 10, Chapters 4 and 5. Cf. B. J. Kidd, *The Churches of Eastern Christendom From A.D. 451 to the Present Time* (London, 1927), 84–86, and A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First,* 132–253.
27. John of Ephesus, "Lives of the Eastern Saints: Spurious Life of James," trans. into English by E. W. Brooks in *Patrologia Orientalis* 19, ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau (Paris, 1925), 256.
28. Ibid., 256, footnote 3.
29. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 496–99, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 63–64, where the author follows Assemani, who in turn copies al-Qilaᶜi and al-Duwayhi.
30. Kamal S. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 13, and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 356.
31. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 356–57 claims that Serum, allegedly the native village of John Marun, is the present-day Sarmania and not Sermin. This Sarmania, he alleges, is the one meant by the author of the life of James (Jacob Baradaeus). While Sarmanis is located in the Suwaydiyya Mountain, Sermin is located in the plain which connects Aleppo with Maᶜarrat al-Nuᶜman at a considerable distance from al-Suwaydiyya. Daww contends that in the time of the Crusades this Sarmania was a fief of a Germanic family known as the Sarmani, one of whose princes was Gerais of Sarmania of Antioch. It was finally conquered by Saladin in 1188. Even if we accept this preposterous account as true, the fact still remains that John Marun and John of Serum were two different persons, and that the John mentioned in the life of James is meant to be John of Serum, patriarch of Constantinople and not John Marun whom Maronites claim as the first Maronite patriarch of Antioch.
32. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 66. On p. 57, together with the footnote, al-Duwayhi states that John Marun became patriarch in 685.
33. Garshuni MS 25, p. 58, at the Library of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus, Syria.
34. Ibid.; Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 499; and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 62.
35. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 62.
36. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris,* 18–20.

37. For these letters see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 40; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 10, 798; and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 116. See also Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages* 1, 389–91.

38. Ibid.

39. For the letter of Pope Martin to Theodore of Esbus see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 29; Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 10, 806–822; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 117; and Michel Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* 11 (Paris, 1740), 682.

40. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 62, and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 499.

41. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 67–77. For a date of the death of the Pope Honorius see Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 66.

42. Garshuni MS 25, p. 58 at the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus, and Vatican Arabic MS 75, pp. 103–104.

43. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53–54. For a short biography of Abdisho and a reference to the edition of his *Catalogue of Books* by Abraham Ecchellensis see William Wright, *A Short History of Syriac Literature* (London, 1894), 285–88.

44. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 510, and 11, 306. In his *al-Durr al-Manzum,* 144 the Maronite Patriarch Bulus Masʿad is also of the opinion that the John of Abdisho is not John Marun.

45. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 11, 306 the footnote and 111, 189.

46. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 54.

47. Ibid., 58–59.

48. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 111, 283.

49. Stefano Evodio Assemani, *Acta Sanctorum Martyrum Orientalium et Pocidentlium in duas partes distributu* 4 (Rome, 1748), 408.

50. Al-Dwuayhi, *Tarikh,* 62–63, 70, 88–90, 335; Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 499–505; and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 68, where the author follows both al-Duwayhi and Assemani.

51. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 74 and where the author confuses the Marada or Mardaites with the Maronites, Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 502, and 11, 263, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 34–47.

16—JOHN MARUN: WAS HE A PATRIARCH OF ANTIOCH?

1. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 66, 75, and Faustus Nairon, *Dissertatio de origine, nomine ac religione Maronitarum* (Rome, 1679), 33. The author states that John Marun went to Rome in the company of the papal legate and was consecrated a patriarch by Pope Honorius. See also Rev. Peter Eid in Pierre Raphael, *Role of the Maronites,* 16, who repeats the preposterous opinions of other Maronites like Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs.

2. Yuhanna Ujaymi, *al-Hujja al-Rahina fi Haqiqat Asl al-Mawarina.* Manuscript copy of this treatise is at Dayr al-Karym, Lebanon Arabic MS 16, pp. 1–74. The pagination is mine. Originally this treatise was written in the form of a letter addressed by Ujaymi to Elias Abdo, a prominent Christian from Aleppo. The letter was written in 1769 but was copied in the next year by Brother Constantine. This work was published under the above title in Cairo in 1900. See al-Kraym Arabic MS 16 and p. 3 of the published copy.

3. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 972–89; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 169; and Armala, "al-Malikiyyun," 112.

4. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 75, and Faustus Nairon, *Dissertatio,* 33.

5. Al-Qilaʿi, *Marun al-Tubani* in the Vatican Garshuni, MS 640, pp. 168–69. Ibn Batriq mentions the name of this Pope as Agabius and not Abagrio. Al-Qilaʿi and al-Duwayhi also mistook this Abagrio for Pope Agathon. See Ibn Batriq, *Kitab al-Tarikh* 34, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 75–76.

6. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 76.

7. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 499–505. Assemani refers to Quaresmio, *Historica Theologia,* Book I, Chapter 37, p. 96 of the 1st ed., and 72–73 of the 2nd ed.

8. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris* 4, 20.

9. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 499–505. According to al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53, 64, this information about John Marun was related by the Chorepiscopus Rizq Allah nicknamed Ibn al-Kharita to Rev. Francisco Quaresmio, abbot of the Latin monks in Jerusalem, who translated it into Latin and had it published in Europe in 1634 in order to demonstrate that the Maronites held the same faith as the Church of Rome and are vindicated thus from "heresy."

10. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 66; Constantine, *Patriarchs of Antioch,* in Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church,* 167; Rustam, *Kanisat Madinat,* 11, 63, and the list of Chalcedonian patriarchs appended to p. 361 of the same.

11. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Juris* 4, 20.

12. For a copy of the acts of the Lebanese Council see the Bibliothèque Orientale, Université St. Joseph Arabic MS 537. This copy is not paginated. Book 111, Chapter 4. Another paginated copy of the same is in the Bibliothèque Des Missionaries De St. Paul, Harisa, Lebanon, Arabic MS 106, pp. 236–37, 272.

13. Ibid.

14. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 366, footnote 1. For a brief survey of the Maronite patriarchs from 635 to 1672 by Istefan al-Duwayhi see Dayr al-Kraym MS 123, pp. 148–85. Al-Duwayhi's list of patriarchs is reproduced at the end of the acts of the Lebanese Council in St. Paul MS 106, pp. 381–87. The list ends with Patriarch Yusuf Hubaysh (d. 1845). See also Yusuf Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina* (Beirut, 1958), 18–25. Daghir who follows al-Duwayhi provides no appropriate information about the early Maronite patriarchs until the twelfth century.

15. Al-Duwayhi, St. Paul MS 106, pp. 381–87, Dayr al-Kraym MS 123, pp. 148–85. The author gives the following reasons for the lack of information about Maronite patriarchs from John Marun in the late seventh century to the occupation of Syria by the Crusaders. The main reasons are: the limited amount of historical chronicles at that time and that Maronite books were destroyed because of wars. This author finds these reasons unconvincing. Many Syrians suffered because of the same wars, yet a great number of their religious books survived. Al-Dibs, in *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 172–73 repeats al-Duwayhi's argument but without justification. Joseph Dahdah lists the patriarchs of the Maronites from St. Peter to the Chalcedonian Patriarch Theopanes whom he alleges was succeeded by John Marun. Concerning the patriarchs who succeeded John Marun, Dahdah follows al-Duwayhi. See Joseph al-Dahdah, *The Geography of Syria,* 21–29, 40–49. Dahdah's list ends with the patriarch Yuhanna (John) al-Hajj. See also St. Paul, Harisa MS 106, pp. 292–94, 381–82.

16. Al-Duwayhi, *Ibid.*

17. Al-Duwayhi, *Ibid.*; St. Paul, Harisa MS 106, *Ibid.,* and Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 18–29.

18. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 72, 128. For the text of this letter of Pope Benedict XIV, see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum* (Rome, 1911), 340–46.

19. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 72, 128.

20. Dawud, *Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 368.

21. For the sixth canon of the Council of Nicea see Charles Joseph Hefele, *History of the Councils* 1, 388–89, where the Greek text of this canon and English translations are given. See also Isaac Boyle, *A Historical View of the Council of Nicea with a Translation of Documents* (Philadelphia, 1879), 55.

22. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 74. See also Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 66, and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 502–503.

23. *The Syriac Chronicle . . . of Zachariah of Mitylene,* Book 8, Chapter 1, p. 190 of the English translation. Cf. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History,* Book 4, Chapter 4.

24. Yuhanna Baptista Badhinjana, *Mir'at al-Haqq al-Wadiyya,* 67, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 76. Donald Attwater is of the opinion that the concession of the title of patriarch "can only be looked on as an act of grace on the part of the Holy See." He goes on to say that this title was first acknowledged by Pope Alexander IV in 1254. See Donald Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East* 1, 2nd ed. (Milwaukee, 1947), 69, footnote 19. It is clear from this statement that the title "Patriarch of Antioch" as used by Maronite patriarchs is considered by the See of Rome as an act of grace rather than a historical and canonical right.

25. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 460.

26. The *Zajaliyya* of al-Qilaʿi is commonly known as *Madihat Kisrawan.* See Dayr Mar Dumit Garshuni MS 454, pp. 1–29. For an English translation of portions of this *Zajaliyya* see Kamal S. Salibi, *Maronite Historians of Medieval Lebanon* (Beirut, 1959), 1–87. See also *al-Majalla al-Suriyya* 5 (1930), 513–50, 602–618; 6 (1931), 33–40, 160–68, 464–72, 529–36, 617–24, 637–78; and 7 (1932), 321–28, 401–408. Excerpts of this *Zajaliyya* will be found in Philip Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan ʿan Tarikh Lebnan wa Safha min Akhbar al-Suryan* 1 (Beirut, 1947), 83–90. There is also a Garshuni copy of the same at the Vatican Library Arabic MS 210 copied in 1654. See also Faustus Nairon, *Dissertatio,* 34; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 62–63, 82, 90; Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 505, who follows al-Qilaʿi; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 68. Cf. the Garshuni MS 25, p. 59 at the Library of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate in Damascus.

27. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 78–79.

28. Ibid., 79.

29. Ibid., 79–80.

30. Ibid., 81. Hitti, *Lebanon in History* 249, and Atiya in his *History of Eastern Christianity,* 396, seems to accept al-Duwayhi's fabricated episode about the destruction of the Monastery of Marun by the Byzantine army at the "battle of Amiun" in 694.

31. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 81.

32. Ibid., 82.

33. Ibid., 82–83.

34. Ibid., 90.

35. Ibid., 90 together with footnote 1.

36. Ibid., 90, where al-Duwayhi claims that the "Maronite army" killed more than 200,000 Arabs.

37. Ibid., 91.

38. Ibid., 91.

39. Philip Hitti in his *History of Syria,* 521–22, and his *Lebanon in History,* 249, follows Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 504, who repeats this same preposterous episode related by al-Duwayhi without verification. Kamal Salibi, quoting Tobias Anaissi, *Silsila Tarikhiyya li Batarikat al-Mawarina (A Historical Table of the Maronite Patriarchs)*

(Rome, 1927), 14, seems to accept the same fictitious episode that John Marun was also called John of Serum and that in 685 the Byzantine army destroyed the Monastery of Marun and dispursed its monks. See Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 3. Cf. al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 69, and Yusuf Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan,* 178–85. Muzhir follows al-Duwayhi and al-Dibs but without proper investigation.

40. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 22, p. 467, and 11, 511 of the French translation.

41. Al-Masʿudi, *Kitab al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf* (Cairo, 1938), 131–32.

42. Tal Mahri, in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 15, p. 446, and 11, 470 of the French translation.

43. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 79–80. Asad Rustam, *al-Rum fi Siyasatihim wa Hadaratihim wa Dinihim wa Thaqafatihim wa Silatihim bi al-Arab (The Byzantines: Their Politics, Civilization, Religion, Culture and Relations with the Arabs)* 1 (Beirut, 1955), 265–66 reiterates this episode related by al-Duwayhi which is without historical foundation.

44. Theophanes, *Chronographia* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 739.

45. On Simʿan, presumed to be nephew of the Mardaite leader John, see *Regesten der Kaiserkunde des Ostronische Reiches,* p. 257, quoted by Asad Rustam, *al-Rum,* 265.

46. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1132–136, and G. Krüger, "Monothelitism," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* 8, ed. James Hastings (1916), 824.

47. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1136–185 contains the transactions of the Council. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum* 11, 930, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 223.

48. On this point see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 178–79.

49. The Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate Library Garshuni MS 25, p. 58; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 68, 82; and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 504.

50. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 82–83, 345.

51. See for example Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 358, who uses this source to establish the identity of John Marun.

52. See this episode in Vatican Arabic MS 74, p. 104, according to the pagination of the Vatican Library. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj* 293, quotes part of this episode to prove that John Marun was a Monothelite.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. See this *Zajaliyya* in Mar Dumit Garshuni MS 454, pp. 7–9.

56. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 90, 92.

57. Ibid., 90.

58. Ibid.

59. Ibid., 93.

60. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 505 the footnote, and by the same author *Italicae Historiae Scriptores* 11, 130–31.

61. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 95.

62. Ibid.

63. Assemani, *Italicae Historiae Scriptores* 11, 130–31.

17—JOHN MARUN'S WRITINGS

1. These two books are also contained in Vatican Syriac MS 101. They were transcribed by Abraham Ecchellensis and ascribed to John Marun, Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 159.

2. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 520, and 11, 534.

3. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 186–204.

4. Assemani, *bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 512. Vatican Syriac MS 29 contains twenty-one liturgies including the one ascribed to John Marun. These liturgies were copied for the use of the Maronite Church, and were drawn up by the leading fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church such as Liʿazar (Lazarus) Bar Sabto, bishop of Baghdad, Marutha, metropolitan of Tagrit, Tuma of Harclea, and others. Among these liturgies is one entitled "A Liturgy of St. John, Patriarch of the Maronites known as Marun, the Saint and Doctor of the Church." This liturgy is followed by two notes, one in Syriac stating that "every priest should celebrate this liturgy on the 9th of February which is the commemoration day of John Marun"; the other in Garshuni with the postscript "This liturgy was completed by the priest Yamin, son of Salim from the village of Haqil in Syria who transcribed it in the village of Jnablin in Cyprus in Tishrin (October) of the year 1846 of the Greeks (1535 A.D.)."

5. Assemani, Ibid., and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 57, the footnote. See also al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 181–90, and by the same author *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 79–80. Rev. Jean B. Chabot published the Syriac text of this liturgy with Latin translation entitled *La Liturgie Attribuée À Saint Jean Maron* (Paris, 1940). Chabot believes that this liturgy is apocryphal and does not belong to John Marun, see p. 7.

6. Eusèbe Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio* 1 (Paris, 1847), preface, 11, 4, 7, 15, and 344. This work was reprinted with an introduction by J. M. Hussey (Franborough: Greg, 1970).

7. *Ibid.,* 11, preface, 4, 7, 15, 383.

8. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 512.

9. Antoine Villien, *L'abbé Eusèbe Renaudot, essay sur sa vie et son oevre liturgique* (Paris, 1904), 250.

10. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 159–61.

11. *Missale Chaldiacum Iuxta ritum Ecclesiae nationis Maronitarum* (Rome, 1594), containing liturgies written by fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church. The Liturgy of St. Peter which Maronites allege is the liturgy they call "Sharar," appears at the end of this collection and is not of Maronite origin. It is most likely a plagiarism of the liturgy of Mari and Addai used since Apostolic times by the Eastern Syrian Church (Nestorian) before and after it adopted "Nestorianism" in the second half of the fifth century. There was no "Maronite Church" to use this liturgy at that time. The Syrian Catholic Patriarch Rahmani who compared the liturgy of St. Peter with the alleged liturgy of Sharar should have recognized that the latter is a plagiarism of the former. See Ignatius Rahmani, *al-Mabahith al-Jaliyya fi al-Liturgiyyat al-Sharqiyya wa al-Gharbiyya* (al-Sharfa Monastery, 1924), 411–34. From the comment on p. 432 of this work we learn that Maronite copyists have been accused of tampering with this liturgy. In a commentary on the Maronite liturgy, Rev. Joseph Seely Beggiani presents no evidence that Sharar is a Maronite Liturgy. See Rev. Joseph Seely Beggiani, *A Brief History And Commentary Of The Divine Liturgy Of The Maronite Antiochene Church* (Diocese of St. Maron of Detroit, 1973), 1–4, 36–37.

12. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 159–61.

13. See above note 11.

14. The Chorepiscopus Mikha'il al-Rajji, "Fi al-Taqs al-Maruni," *(On Maronite Rite), al-Mashriq* 33 (Beirut, 1935), 515. Cf. Rev. Francis al-Baysari "Muqabala bayn al-Imadh al-Yaʿqubi al-Qadim wa al-Imadh al-Maruni al-Hadith," *al-Mashriq* 62 (1968), 139–54. this comparison between the old Baptismal order of the Jacobites and new Baptismal order of the Maronites shows the heavy dependence of the latter on the former.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., 486.

17. Dib, *Etude sur la Liturgie Maronites* (Paris, 1919), 40, and al-Rajji, "Fi al-Taqs," 487.

18. For al-Dibs's argument see *Ruh al-Rudud,* 188–90. The information given by the Syrian Roman Catholic Patriarch Rahmani is superficial and does not substantiate the fact that the Maronites have liturgies of their own. Rahmani assigns to the Maronites three liturgies, none of which is really Maronite. One of these is the liturgy ascribed to St. Peter, head of the Apostles, which is no other than the East Syrian liturgy of Mar Addai. See above note 11. Rahmani states that this liturgy was first published in Rome in 1592, but he regrets that it was never printed again. One may ask that if this liturgy is a genuine Maronite liturgy, why was it not printed again by the Maronites? We know that since the end of the sixteenth century the Maronites have printed and reprinted many liturgies except for this one ascribed to Saint Peter. Rahmani assigns two more liturgies to the Maronites. One is the liturgy ascribed to John Marun which is none other than the liturgy of the Twelve Apostles of the Syrian Orthodox church; the other is the liturgy attributed to Yuhanna al-Lihfidi (d. 1174), but Rahmani states that he could not find a copy of this liturgy. This author tends to believe that no such liturgy ever existed. See Rahmani *al-Mabahith al-Jaliyya,* 407–434.

19. This copy is contained in Vatican Syriac MS 101. Another copy transcribed in 1902 is contained in Dayr al-Kraym Syriac MS 31. Cf. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 520, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 162. See also Joseph Hobeiqa *Explication de la Liturgie Syriaque par Saint Jean Maron 627–707, Traduite du Syriaque en Arabe* (Beirut, 1922). For a Latin translation of the same see Giuseppe Luigi (Joseph Alois) Assemani, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiae universae* 5 (Rome, 1752), 227–397. For further source on the same see Georg Graf, *Geschichte Der Christlichen* 264.

20. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 162–63.

21. See *The Liturgy of St. James* published by Mar Athansius Y. Samuel (1967, n.p.), 50.

22. Renaudot, 11, p. 8 of the part entitled *Dissertatio De Syriacis Melchitarum Et Jacobitarum Liturgiis.*

23. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 520, and 11, 176.

24. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 92, and by the same author *Ruh al-Rudud,* 194–95.

25. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 93, 99, and by the same author *Ruh al-Rudud,* 196–97. Al-Dibs is referring to Gieuseppe Luigi (Alois) Assemani, *Codex liturgieus ecclesia universae* 4 (Rome, 1752).

26. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 93–96. For a Latin translation of this *Exposition,* see Assemani, *Codex liturgicus* 5, 227–397.

27. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* and *Ruh al-Rudud,* 146–203.

28. Ibid.

29. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 11, entire Chapters 18 and 32, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 95, where the author produces Y. L. Assemani's argument.

30. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 97.

31. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio* 11, 7–8 of the part entitled *Dissertation De Syriacis,* etc.

32. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 163.

33. Dawud, Ibid., 163–64. See also Vatican Syriac MS 101. A more recent copy of this MS was transcribed in 1646 by Yusuf, son of the Shidyaq Khatir al-Hasruni. It is

contained in Vatican Syriac MS 102. A third copy also at the Vatican Library was transcribed in 1455. According to Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud there is another copy of the same in the Sharfa Monastery in Lebanon transcribed in 1224. See Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 164, footnote 2. In 1904 Jerome Labourt published this commentary after MSS 208 and 209 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. The Syrian Patriarch of Antioch Ignatius Afram Barsoum reports in *al-Luʾlu al-Manthur,* 482 that there are two more copies of this commentary, one in the Syrian Orthodox Church of the Forty Martyrs in Mardin, Turkey, and the other in the village of Hbab in Tur Abdin, Turkey. There is yet another Syriac copy of this commentary in Dayr al-Kraym, Lebanon MS 31 a transcribed in 1902 from a copy dated 1670 attributed by the copyist to John Marun.

34. See the Arabic translation of Bar Salibi's *Exposition of the Eucharistic Service* made by Musa Ibn Atsha in Vatican Arabic MS 74. For a Latin translation of the same see Dionysius Bar Salibi, *Expositio liturgiae,* ed. and trans. into Latin by Hieronymous (Jerome) Labourt, (Paris, 1903), in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 13–14. Scriptores Syriac, Ser. 2, t. 98. This *Expositio* was reprinted by Louvain, 1955.

35. M l' Abbé Labourt, *Antiqua ecclesia syro-Chaldiacae tradition circa petri apostoli ejusque successorum romanorum pontificum divinum primatur* (Rome, 1879), 102–103.

36. For a Syriac text of these quotation and their Arabic translation see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 169–70.

37. Ibid.

38. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 479.

39. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 172.

40. Ibid.

41. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 520.

42. Ibid., I, 520, and 11, 123 and 534. Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 174, and Vatican Syriac MS 101. See also Rev. Mikha'il al-Rajji, "Bayan ʿan Kitab al-Kahnut," *al-Mashriq* 47 (1953), 642–45, in which the author states that John of Dara is the author of the book *On Priesthood.*

43. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 520.

44. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 175. These writings by Moses Bar Kifa contained in the Sharfa MS are: "On the Ordination of Deacons and Priests," "On the Consecration of the Holy Chrism," "On Baptism," and "On the Exposition of the Eucharistic Service."

45. Ibid., 175.

46. Ibid. Cf. al-Rajji, "Bayan ʿan Kitab al-Kahnut," 647.

47. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 190–92, and by the same author *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 88–91.

48. See the argument of Yusuf Louis Assamani in al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 89–90.

49. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 192, and *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 89, 91.

50. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 174.

51. Mikha'il al-Rajji, "Fi al-Taqs," 481–522. Al-Rajji exerted great effort to prove that the Maronites had their own church rituals, books, and rites, but in the opinion of the present writers he failed to substantiate his point. In fact, the indirect conclusion one receives from his article is that the ritual books of the Maronites and the "Jacobites" are identical, which indicates that the Maronites had no ritual books of their own. It is surprising that al-Rajji, who claims that Sharar is a Maronite liturgy, made no effort to prove that this Sharar is of Maronite origin. See particularly pp. 482, 497, 501, 515, and 522 of the same article.

52. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 513, 520. The *Exposition of the Faith* is contained in Vatican Syriac and Garshuni MS 146, pp. 1–125. This MS comprises two columns, one in Syriac and the opposite column containing a Garshuni (Arabic written in Syriac letters) translation. The *Exposition* is followed by a treatise allegedly written by John Marun in refutation of the Monophysites and Nestorians. Several pages following page 121 were torn and replaced by others written in new hand. Furthermore, the pages dealing with the phrase *Thou who wast crucified for us* were probably added by Abraham Ecchellensis. The Reverend Nau published the Syriac text of the *Exposition of the Faith* with French translation. See Nau, *Opuscules Maronites,* 1–33, of the Syriac text, and 1–52 comprising the French translation. Two more copies of the *Exposition of the Faith* are at the Library of the Maronite Patriarchate in Bkerki, Lebanon. Another Garshuni copy is at Dayr al-Kraym MS 31 a transcribed by Simʿan Basim al-Shidyaq in the year 1861 of the Greeks (1550 A.D.). This copy is probably made from another copy at the library of the Monastery of Mar Shallita in Lebanon. See Rev. Ibrahim Harfush, "al-Adyar al-Qadima fi Kisrawan," *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903), 116–17. For more information on copies of this work see Georg Graf, *Geschichte der Christlichen,* 102.

53. Nau, *Opuscules Maronites,* 6–7.

54. Ibid. For this metrical hymn see British Museum Syriac MS Add. 17, 172, fol. 83 and William Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts,* 596–97. This hymn was translated into French and published by François Nau. See L' abbé François Nau, "Lettre De Jacques D' Édesse Au Diacre George," *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* (Paris, 1901), 115–31.

55. Nau, *Opuscules Maronites,* 6–7, and "Lettre De Jacques D' Édesse," 118–20.

56. William Wright, *Syriac Literature* (London, 1894), 143.

57. Reverend Jean B. Chabot, "Les Origines des la légende de Saint Jean Maron," in *Extrait des Mémoire de l'Academie Inscription* 43, no. 2 (Paris, 1935).

58. Nau, "Lettre De Jacques D' Édesse," 119–20.

59. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 85.

60. Yusuf Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 260. Deryan relates that he found this copy at the library of Saints Peter and Paul School which belongs to the family of Mubarak Masʿud in Ashqut, Lebanon. This MS contains the *Exposition of the Faith* together with the *Ten Treatises* of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab. Deryan further states that he collated this MS with Vatican MS 146 and found them identical. He preferred to use the Ashqut MS. See Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 262.

61. this Syrian Orthodox source contains the debate between the Syrian poet David Bar Paul with a Chalcedonian Malkite over the Trisagion. See below note 72. Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud elaborates on this point in *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 150–51.

62. Vatican MS 146, p. 1. Cf. the four photographed pages of this MS at the beginning of Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj.*

63. Vatican MS 146, p. 1, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 3–4.

64. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 149–50.

65. Ibid.

66. Vatican MS 146, pp. 2–3.

67. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 149–50.

68. Ibid.

69. Ibid.

70. On Cyrus see *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu,* translated into English by R. H. Charles (London, 1916), 185–86, 190–96, passim, and Hefele, *History of the Councils,* 5, 12, 14, 18, 65.

71. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 578–1121, containing the transactions of the Sixth

Council which condemned Monothelitism.

72. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 152, and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 518. David Bar Paul, a prominent Syrian Orthodox poet, wrote a theological debate on the Trisagion. See above note 61.

73. Asesmani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 513–14.

74. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 339. This comment by al-Qilaᶜi appears at the end of Ashqut MS. See Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 261, footnote 1.

75. Ibid.

76. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 339, 348.

77. Faustus Nairon, *Evoplia fidei Catholicae romanae* (Rome, 1694), 96. Al-Dwuayhi, *Tarikh,* 339 also provides portions of al-Qilaᶜi's *Zajaliyya* describing Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, as a "Jacobite" from Mardin who went to Lebanon to deceive the people of that country to adopt Monothelitism. Deryan in *Lubab al-Barahin,* 260, footnote 1, reproduces the comment of al-Qilaᶜi on this MS of Ashqut. On this point see also al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 307, 312–14, and by the same author *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 81.

78. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 511, 513. See also al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 310–12, and *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 82–83. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* 111, 18 reiterates Assemani's statement.

79. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 511, 513.

80. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 216.

81. Ibid.

82. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 339–40, and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 111, 544, where the author quotes al-Duwayhi, who admits that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, was a Maronite.

83. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 508. For more information about the claim of the Maronites that Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, has distorted their books see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hijaj,* 150–51, 232–38, 328–30.

84. Rev. Seméon Vailhé, "L' Église Maronite," 267–68.

85. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 513–14, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 84–85. See also E. Ajam, "Le Monothélisme Des Maronites D' Après Les Auteurs Melchites," *Echos D' Orient 9 (Paris, 1906), 93.*

*86. See the French translation of this work by Fran*çois Nau in *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* 4 (Paris, 1899), 184, 188–219. For more information about Leontius of Byzantium see Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 81, 1769–902.

87. Nau, *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 4, 184, 188–219, and Vailhé, "Le Église Maronite," 267.

88. Vatican MS 146, p. 2.

89. E. Ajam, "Le Monothélisme Des Maronites," 91–95.

90. Vatican MS 146, p. 31 and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 153. See also the French translation of the *Exposition of the Faith* by F. Nau in *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* 4 (1899), 197.

91. Nau, ibid.

92. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 510.

93. Vatican MS 146, p. 4, and Dayr al-Kraym Garshuni MS 319, p. 3.

94. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 154–55.

95. Ibid.

96. Vatican MS 146, p. 73, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 155.

97. Vatican MS 146, p. 102, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 155.

18—WAS JOHN MARUN A CANONIZED SAINT?

1. The reference here is to the Uniate, or that group of the Rum (Byzantine) Orthodox Church which joined the Church of Rome in the eighteenth century and assumed the name Malkite, which had been dropped by the original Malkites (Rum Orthodox) in the twelfth century.

2. Istefan Awwad Assemani in *Kitab al-Muhamat ʿan al-Mawarina wa Qiddisihim,* comp. the priest Afram al-Dirani (n.p., 1899), 109–110, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* p. 104.

3. Assemani in *Muhamat,* 111. The picture of John Marun was drawn by order of Pope Clement XI in 1717 together with other portraits, including the portrait of the Maronite Patriarch Irmia (Jeremiah) al-Amshiti. The picture of John Marun and that of al-Amshiti are almost identical.

4. For the letter of Tanas to Pope Benedict XIV see Bibliothèque Orientale, Université St. Joseph MS 750. On page 20, Tanas states that a certain person in Aleppo destroyed the portrait of the ascetic Marun on the grounds that he was a heretic.

5. For the Latin text of this papal bull see Tobias Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 340–46. For an Arabic translation of the same bull see al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 120–28, and *Muhamat,* 231–34, 446–57.

6. *Muhamat,* 212–13.

7. For this statement of Arsanius Shukri see *Muhamat,* 183–86.

8. See Shukri's statement in *Muhamat,* 184–85.

9. This letter is signed by Zachariah, deputy of Ignatius Karbus, the Uniate Malkite bishop of Aleppo, on behalf of the clergy and congregation of the Malkite denomination. See *Mahamat,* 214–15.

10. *Muhamat,* 216.

11. See these indulgences in al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 129–30.

12. For these testimonies, especially those presented by the Maronite Patriarch Yusuf Istefan see *Muhamat,* 270–305, and Anton Qayyala's response to Ujaymi's opinions in *Muhamat,* 85–94.

13. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 53, 63–64, 75, 89, where he calls John Marun a saint. Cf. Yusuf Istefan in *Muhamat,* 239.

14. Istefan in *Muhamat,* 242, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 106, where the author follows Istefan.

15. Istefan in *Muhamat,* 242, 274–75.

16. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 139–40.

17. Istefan in *Muhamat,* 246, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 106.

18. *Missale Chaldiacum Iuxta ritum Ecclesiae Nationis Maronitarum* (Rome, 1594), 29, 224. Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 139.

19. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 145.

20. Istefan in *Muhamat,* 281–82.

21. Ibid., 282, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 109.

22. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 144. Both the portrait of John Marun and the caption beneath it which reads, "Saint John Marun, the first Maronite Patriarch of Antioch," appears in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* between pp. 52 and 53.

23. Istefan in *Muhamat,* 270–74, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 105, 107.

24. For the text of this letter see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 340–46; al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 120–28; and *Muhamat,* 446–57.

25. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 343, and 316–17 for the pope's letter of indulgence dated August 12, 1744.

26. Ibid., 346.

27. Dawud, *Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 142–43.

28. Ibid.

29. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 223.

30. See the acts of the Lebanese Council in the *Bibliothèque Orientale,* Université St. Joseph Arabic MS 537. This copy is not paginated. Another paginated copy is in the Bibliothéque des Missionaries de St. Paul, Harisa, Lebanon Arabic MS 106.

31. See J. B. Chabot, "Les Origines de la legénde."

32. Eusèbe Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio* 11, pp. 7 and 8 of the part entitled *Dissertation De Syriacis,* etc.

33. J. Labourt, "Maronites," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 9, ed. Charles G. Hebermann, (New York, 1913), 686, and Vailhé, "Les Église Maronite," 268.

19—THE RELATION OF THE MARONITES TO THE MARDAITES AND THE JARAJIMA

1. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 34–53, and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 302–325, especially Chapter 8, in which Daww discussed the "Formulation of the Maronite Nation," but without historical substantiation.

2. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 52.

3. Ibid., 62–3, 68–70.

4. Henri Lammens, *Tasrih.*

5. Lammens, *Tasrih* 11, 50–51. For the Syriac text of this debate and its German translation see Theodor Nöldeke, "Zur Geschichte der Araber im 1. Jahr d. h. aus Syrischen Quellen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft (ZDMG)* 29 (1875), 89–94. For the same Syriac text see Nau, *Opuscules Maronites,* 36–37, and E. B. Brooks and J. B. Chabot in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium (GSCO)* Syriac texts, 4 (Paris, 1903), 55. Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 208 provides a loose Arabic translation of the same text.

6. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 50–52.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. Nöldeke, "Zur Geschichte," 90 of the Syriac text and p. 95 of the German translation; Nau, *Opuscules Maronites,* 36; and E. W. Brooks and Chabot, *CSCO,* 55.

10. Nöldeke, "Zur Geschichte," 90.

11. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 80–81.

12. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 85, 90–91. See also al-Masʿudi, *Kitab al-Tanbih,* 130–32.

13. On the Anbat see Theodor Nöldeke, "Die Namen der aramaischen Nation und Sprache," *ZDMG* 25 (1871), 113–31.

14. Bar Hebraeus, *Tarikh,* 127.

15. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 53.

16. Henri Lammens, "al-Marada," *al-Mashriq* 5 (1902), 826, 830, and by the same author *Tasrih,* 11, 45–48. See also Anastase al-Karmali, "al-Marada aw al-Jarajima," *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903), 301–309.

17. M. Canard, "Djarajima," *The Encyclopedia of Islam* 11 (1965), 456–58.

18. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 501–507, and 4, 620–22. For a summary of the opinions of Maronite writers on this subject see Lammens, "al-Marada," 826–830. See

also al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 35, footnote 1, and 41–47.

19. Yusuf al-Dibs, "Laysa al-Jarajima al-Marada," *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903), 403–418. To this article is appended a commentary by Father Henri Lammens, in which he disagrees on many points with the author. For al-Dibs's opinion that the Marda were the Maronites see his *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 41–47.

20. Theophanes, *Chronographia* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 722–23. According to Tal Mahri the Mardaites, in Syriac Maridoye, attacked Lebanon and occupied the country from the Mount of Galilee to the Black Mountain in the ninth year of the Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus. Considering that Constantine ascended the throne in 668, this attack by the Mardaites of Lebanon must have taken place in 677. The difference between the dates provided by Tal Mahri and Theophanes is evident. See Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 13; 437, and 11, 455 of the French translation.

21. Theophanes, ibid. Canard, "Djarajima," 456–59 provides the dates (641–648) for the Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus. A more correct date is 668–685.

22. Theophanes, *Chronographia* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 722–23.

23. According to Tal Mahri the rebellion against the Umayyad Caliphs began in the time of Yazid Ibn Muᶜawiya in 683. It abated in the time of Marwan Ibn al-Hakam only to erupt once more in 685 when Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwan came to power. In this year Abd Allah revolted in Iraq, Ibn Hubab in Ras al-Ayn, and also a certain Bedouin in Nisibin. In addition, Umar Ibn Saᶜid controlled Damascus and Zufar occupied Qarqaysun (Circesium). See Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 15, p. 445, and 11, 469 of the French Translation.

24. Theophanes, *Chronographia* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 733. Theophanes couldn't have been correct in establishing the date of the peace treaty which Abd al-Malik signed with the Byzantine emperor, whereby he agreed to pay a heavy tribute in the year 676. For we know that Abd al-Malik became caliph in 685. This peace treaty must have been concluded with the Emperor Constantine IV, Pogonatus, before his death in September, 685. The second ten-year peace treaty, which Theophanes also mentions, must have been concluded between Abd al-Malik and the Emperor Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, who succeeded his father Constantine IV to the throne in 685, not in 677 as Theophanes has erroneously stated. Tal Mahri, who mentions this ten-year treaty, does not provide a date for it. But from his narrative we may learn that it must have been signed in the year 685. See Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 15, pp. 445–46, and 11, 469 of the French translation. Bar Hebraeus is incorrect in placing this treaty in 689. See Bar Hebraeus, *Tarikh,* 112.

25. Theophanes, *Chronographia* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108, 733.

26. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 15, p. 446, and 11, 469 of the French translation.

27. Lammens, "al-Marada," 826–37, and by the same author *Tasrih,* 11, 42, quoting Saglio et Derenberg, *Dictionarie des antiques grecques et latines* 1, 1374.

28. Anquetil Duperron, "Mémoires sur les migrations des Mardes," *Mémoires Academie Inscription* 14, 87 and L.1., and Rambaud, *L' Empire grec au X Siècle,* 213, quoted by Lammens in "al-Marada," 827–28, and in *Tasrih,* 11, 45.

29. Lammens, "al-Marada," 1122–125, and *Tasrih,* 11, 45.

30. For these views see Lammens "al-Marada," 828–30, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 42–47.

31. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 13, p. 437, and 11, 455 of the French translation.

32. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 47, and by the same author, "al-Marada," 1122–125.

33. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 81. For the opinions of Maronite writers see Faustus Nairon, *Dissertatio da origine,* and by the same author *Evoplia fidei Catholicae romanae* (Rome, 1694). See also Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 507, where the author unjustifiably claims that the term Malkite is counter to the term Mardaites. This opinion is reiterated by other Maronites again without historical foundation. Cf. al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 58–62, and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* entire Chapter 4.

34. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 83.

35. Al-Qilaʿi related a fantastic account of a fight between the Maronites and the Muslims which he states lasted thirty years at the end of which the Maronites appeared victorious. Even though he doesn't mention the Mardaites by name we may still conclude from the context of his narrative that what he meant by the Maronites is the Mardaites. This is confirmed by Daww who, after producing al-Qilaʿi's account, comments that "These wars and the heroism of the Mardaites are but a part of the Maronite heritage." See Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 209. Al-Qilaʿi's account is not supported by any historical evidence; therefore, it is not only groundless but anachronistic. It has been quoted in total by al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 98–100.

36. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 83.

37. Ibid.

38. Al-Karmali, "al-Marada," 301–309.

39. Ibid., The Maronite writer Jouplain is of the same opinion that the Maronites are not the Mardaites. See Jouplain (Bulus Nujaym), *La question du Liban,* 2nd ed. (Jonieh, Liban, 1961), 42. Cf. Fu'ad Qazan, *Lebnan fi Muhitihi al-Arabi* (Beirut, Dar al-Farabi, 1972), 137–41.

40. Al-Karmali, *Ibid.,* p. 309.

41. Al-Baladhuri, *Futuh al-Buldan (The Conquest of Countries)* 1, ed. Salah al-Din al-Munajjid (Cairo, 1956), 189. Bayyas is a small town north of Antioch near al-Iskandarun (Alexandretta) in present-day Turkey. Buqa is a citadel near Antioch in present-day Turkey.

42. Lammens, "al-Marada," 1122–125.

43. Al-Baladhuri, *Futuh,* 189–90.

44. Ibid., 190–91.

45. Ibid., 192.

46. Ibid., 190 and Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 48, and "al-Marada," 1122–123.

47. Lammens, *Tasrih,* 11, 48, and "al-Marada," 1122.

48. Al-Karmali, "al-Marada," 305–307.

49. Yusuf al-Dibs, "al-Marada wa al-Mawarina," *al-Mashriq* 5 (1902), 914–23.

50. Yusuf al-Dibs, "Laysa al-Jarajima al-Marada," *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903), 403–413, and by the same author *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 41–48. The argument of al-Dibs on this point is extremely unclear and only adds more confusion to an already highly dubious issue.

51. Moosa, "The Relation of the Maronites," 508.

52. This is also the opinion of the Maronite Bishop Yusuf Deryan expressed in his book *al-Barahin al-Rahina fi al-Marada wa al-Jarajima wa al-Mawarina* (Beirut, 1904).

53. Deryan, Ibid., 75. See also Shababi, *Tarikh al-Kanisa,* 326–29.

54. Tal Mahri in Michael the Great, *Chronicle,* Book 11, Chapter 13, p. 437, and 11, 455 of the French translation.

55. I owe this explanation to the late Syrian Orthodox Archbishop Bulus Behnam (d. 1969) in his letter to me dated April 26, 1967. See also *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite,* ed. and trans. into English by William Wright, (Cambridge, 1882) 30, where

Wright remarks that the Syrians called the Byzantines Rumoye, that is, "Soldiers." Of interest are the remarks of Alphonse Mingana in this context. See A. Mingana, "Syriac Influence on the Style of the Kur'an," in *John Rylands Library Manchester Bulletin* 11 (London, 1927), 98.

56. Al-Dibs, "al-Marada," 915–18, and by the same author *Ruh al-Rudud,* 258, and *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 43, 53–62.

57. Al-Qilaʿi was perhaps the first to claim the continuous association of the Maronites with the Church of Rome. See his book *Marun al-Tubani* previously cited. This book by al-Qilaʿi comprises four distinct treatises: *Muhdi al-Akhlaq,* pp. 1–38, *Thabat al-Sidq,* pp. 39–95, *Ijhar al-Iman,* pp. 96–174, and *Tajdid al-Mahabba ʿala al-Ittihad,* pp. 174 to the end. It is in the second treatise, *Thabat al-Sidq (Perpetuity of Truth),* that al-Qilaʿi defends the view that the Maronites had always maintained the same faith as that of the Church of Rome, meaning the Chalcedonian faith, and that they were always under the authority of the popes of Rome. Later Maronite writers continued to uphold and defend the claim that since the fifth century the Maronites were "united" with the Church of Rome. Yuhanna Battista Badhinjana devoted a whole book to defending this view. See his *Mirʾat al-Haqq al-Wadiyya fi Sharaf al-Milla al-Maruniyya* previously cited. See also Bulus Masʿad, *al-Durr al-Manzum,* 49, previously cited.

58. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 508.

59. Hitti, *History of Syria,* 449. Hitti states that "in northern Lebanon the Mardaites were fused with the Maronites," but without substantiation. Cf. by the same author, *Lebanon in History,* 246.

60. For more information on these views see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 176–80, 375–82. Dawud contests Assemani's claim that the term Malkite was not used until the tenth century. He produces convincing evidence from the eighth century Nestorian Patriarch Timothy and other authorities such as the Syrian Orthodox writer Dionysius Bar Salibi (d. 1171), proving that the term Malkite was known before the tenth century. According to Bar Salibi this term dates back to the middle of the fifth century when the majority of the Syrians in the Patriarchate of Antioch rejected the definition of faith by the Council of Chalcedon. He referred to those who accepted this definition as Malkites, meaning the partisans of the Emperor (in Syriac Malko or King) Marcian who was instrumental in convening the council of Chalcedon and approving its definition of faith. See also Moosa, "The Relation of the Maronites," 605–608. Like Assemani, the Maronite Bishop al-Dibs is incorrect in stating that the term Malkite has not been mention in any source from the fourth to the tenth century. See al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 61–62.

20—THE MARONITES AND MONOTHELITISM

1. Al-Duwayhi, *Radd al-Tuham,* which comprises the second part of his *Tarikh al-Taʾifa al-Maruniyya (History of the Maronite Denomination),* 292–466. See also John Green, *A Journey From Aleppo to Damascus,* 100–106.

2. For these testimonies see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* and Ajam, "Le Monothélisme Des Maronites," 91–95.

3. Assemani states in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 129 that he took this manuscript with him from Lebanon to Rome. He described it as the twenty-sixth treatise which contains the letter of Rev. Yusuf to the Maronite Metropolitan Dawud dated 1370 of the Greeks (1095 A.D.). This copy was transcribed in the year 1713 of the Greeks (1402 A.D.). It is listed at present under Vatican Garshuni MS 133. Another copy is in Bibliothèque

Nationale, Paris Syriac MS 223. It is almost identical with the Vatican MS 133 except that the name of the Metropolitan Dawud is erased and the name of Tuma is inserted in its place, probably by a Maronite copyist in order to give the impression that Tuma, Bishop of Kfartab, has distorted this book. A colophon written in recent hand following the index reads thus, "Istefan al-Duwayhi, bishop of the Batrun, 1731." This Duwayhi must be nephew of the Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi, who probably owned this copy before it reached Paris. If this copy is the same one that the great al-Duwayhi saw and read, it is probable that he has been misled by the interpolated name of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, and consequently believed *al-Huda, (Nomocanon).* Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 224–26, 337–39, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 223–29. See also Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 629, and 11, 181 for a breakdown of the contents of this book. Dayr al-Kraym Garshuni MS, 31 a contains extracts of the same *Book of al-Huda,* and *Kitab al-Huda wa Tarikh al-Taʾifa al-Maruniyya,* ed. R.W. Butrus Fahd, (Jonieh, Lebanon, 1954).

4. Vatican Garshuni MS 133, p. 22; al-Kraym MS 31 a, p. 92; Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 337; and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 237–38.

5. Vatican MS 133, p. 25; al-Kraym MS 31 a, pp. 93–94; Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 226; and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 240

6. Vatican MS 133, p. 30; al-Kraym MS 31 a, pp. 93–95; Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 226; and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 240–41.

7. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 340–42, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 153. Al-Dibs states without evidence that Arsanius, bishop of Ayn Qura, was living in the Monastery of Mar Edna near the village of Yanuh in Lebanon.

8. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 231.

9. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 237, 340.

10. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 233–36.

11. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 344–46.

12. Ibid., and by the same author *Ihtijaj (Apology),* Garshuni Vatican Library MS 396, pp. 24–25, in which al-Duwayhi refers to Ibn al-Tayyib as a Maronite. The full title of this work is *Ihtijaj ʿan al-Milla al-Maruniyya bi Sabab al-Razaya wa al Bidaʿ al-Lati daʿa biha Alayhim Tuma al-Karmaliti wa Ghayruhu min al-Musannifin (Apology for the Maronite Denomination on Account of the Heresies and Damaging Charges Leveled against Them, by Thomas the Carmelite and Other Writers).*

13. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 34–46, and by the same author *Ihtijaj,* 24–55.

14. See Amr Ibn Matta, *Akhbar Fatarikat al-Mashriq min Kitab al-Majdal (Chronicle of the Patriarch of the East Taken from the Book of the Tower),* ed. Henricus Gesmondi, (Home, 1896), 96–99.

15. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 111, 544.

16. For more information about Vatican Syriac MS 405 and the other two copies of the same at the Chaldean Library in Amid (Diyar Bakr in present-day Turkey), see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 346–47. Dawud says that he obtained his information about these copies from Abd Yeshue Khayyat, Chaldean bishop of al-Imadiyya in Iraq, who later became a patriarch.

17. Vatican Syriac MS 405, the introduction, Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 348–49, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 235–36, footnote 1 continued from p. 231.

18. Vatican Syriac MS 405, p. 162, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 351.

19. Ibid.

20. Vatican Syriac MS 405, p. 199, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 352.

21. Vatican Syriac MS 405, p. 392, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 352.

22. Vatican Syriac MS 405, p. 126, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 352.

23. On this point see Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* p. 236, and the footnote carried from p. 231.

24. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 100–120. The author who follows al-Duwayhi states that the book of *al-Huda* was distorted by Tuma, bishop of Kfartab. He cites Assemani, who also follows al-Duwayhi on this point. See also by the same author *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 179–86.

25. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 112.

26. Vatican Syriac MS 133, p. 30, and al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 112.

27. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 243–51; Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 15–41, and Daww, *Tarikh al-Mawarina,* 375–77.

28. Faustus Nairon, *Dissertatio de origine,* 89–9; al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 111–12; and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 249.

29. Nairon, *Dissertatio de origine,* 89–9?, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 249.

30. Deryan, Ibid., 270–92. For sake of illustration we shall give excerpts from the "Sixth Treatise" as quoted by Deryan. Tuma states: "Because you say that we are in error on account of our belief in two natures united in one will, we wish to explain to you that our Lord Christ is perfect God and perfect man and that He took everything that is human save sin." In the "Fifth Treatise" Tuma challenges John IV, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch stating, "Tell us about your belief in the two wills of Christ; are they united or separate? If you say they are united, then, you find yourself forced to conform to our thesis and recognize one will in Christ much against your wish. And if you say they are separate, then you will find yourself dividing the unity of His two natures and raving like your ancestor Arius and your cousin Nestorius by recognizing two persons in our Lord: one eats and drinks; the other fasts and prays." See Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 273–89.

31. Ibid., 289–90.

32. See this passage in *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 929, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 29. Deryan produces a loose Arabic translation of this passage. See Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 291–92.

33. Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 291–92.

34. Harnack, *History of Dogma,* 252.

35. Ibid., 253 together with footnote 4.

36. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 200–206.

37. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 111, 545, and 4, 210.

38. Harnack, *History of Dogma,* 252.

39. Ibid., 252–53. Harnack states that Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, and Dionysius the Areopagite had taught the doctrine of one energy in Christ, especially the Areopagite, with the addition of "Theandric." See also Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies,* 95; 251–52, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 6–9.

40 For these views see Harnack, *History of Dogma,* 252–53; H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (New York, 1931), 220–22; and Sellers, *Two Ancient Christologies,* 95, 251–52.

41. Harnack, *History of Dogma,* 253.

42. Ibid.

43. Henry Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church,* 2nd. ed. (London, 1963), 128.

44. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 36–41.

45. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1053, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 178, 184.

46. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1053–100, especially p. 1097. Cf. p. 1117 of the same.

47. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1109–121, especially p. 1117.

48. Hefele, *History of the Councils* 4, 184. For more information on Honorius's case, see Horace K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in Early Middle Ages* 1 (London, 1925) 304–305, and Rev. Reuben Parsons, *Studies in Church History,* 3rd. ed., 1 (Philadelphia, 1909), 342–448, where the author devotes entire Chapter 35 to absolving Pope Honorius from heresy. See also P. Bottata, *Pope Honorius Before the Tribunal of Reason and History* (London, 1868), P. Renouf, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (London, 1868), and by the same author, *The Case of Honorius Reconsidered* (London, 1870), and J. Chapman, *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (London, 1907).

49. See Vatican Syriac and Garshuni MS 146, p. 3, where John Marun mentions only the first five ecumenical councils. Cf. the testimony of Germanos, patriarch of Constantinople (715–733) in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 82.

50. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 352–43.

51. This prayer is quoted by al-Duwayhi in his *Ihtijaj,* Vatican Garshuni MS 396, p. 24. The whole apology is directed against Giovanni Battista Eliano, papal delegate to the Maronites.

52. Abraham, *The Maronites of Lebanon,* 63.

53. *Sacrosancta Concilia* 6, 1052, 1096–97. See also *Christology of the Later Fathers* 3, ed. E. Roache Hardy (Philadelphia, 1954), 382–85.

54. Vatican Syriac MS 48, p. 63. This is probably one of the oldest manuscript which contains the orders of ordinations for different church offices. It was transcribed in Lebanon in 1507. Another Ms Vatican Syriac 49 also contains this same passage. Still a third MS and perhaps much older than these two manuscripts contains this passage but the page in which its occurs was torn out, probably by a Maronite who considered it to be a Monothelitic heresy. Cf. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 344.

55. *Patrologia Graeca* 98, 82.

56. John of Damascus, *De Recta Sententia,* ed. Michel Lequien in *Patrologia Graeca* 94, 1431, and by the same author, *Epistola Ad Jordanem Archimandritam De Hymno Trisagio,* in *Patrologia Graeca* 95, 34, especially footnote 4 by Michel Lequien. The same passage is reproduced in Latin as well as Arabic translation in Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 191.

57. John of Damascus, *De Recta Sententia,* 1430, and by the same author *Epistola Ad Jordanem,* 31–32.

58. John of Damascus, *Epistola Ad Jordanem,* 34.

59. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 80–91, and by the same author *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 164–170.

60. For canon 81 of the Quinisext Council see *Sacrosancta Concilia* 5, 1117, and Hefele, *History of the Councils* 5, 234.

61. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Jursi Orientalis* 5 (Rome, 1786), 348.

62. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* 3 (Paris, 1740), 698.

63. Ibid., 43, and the author's footnote to John of Damascus, *Epistola Ad Jordanem,* 34.

64. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* 5, 11, 65.

65. On these two patriarchs see Amr Ibn Matta, *Akhbar Fatarikat,* 60–61, 64–67. On Timothy see William Wright, *A Short History of Syriac Literature,* 191–94.

66. Amr Ibn Matta, *Akhbar Fatarikat,* 65.

67. On the Monothelitism of the Nestorians see Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis,* 111, 545, and 4, 210.

68. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 200.

69. Ibid., 201.

70. Ibid., 201–204.
71. Ibid., 203–204.
72. Ibid., 205.
73. Ibid.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid., 206–207.
76. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 60–66, and *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 170–71.
77. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 258.
78. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 209.
79. François Nau, "Maronites, Mazonites et Maranites," *Revue de Orient Chrétien* 9 (1904), 268–70. See also al-Dibus, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 170–71. Al-Dibs uses Nau's argument to reject Timothy's letter as a testimony of the Monothelitism of the Maronites.

21—THE RELATION OF THE MARONITES TO THE CHURCH OF ROME

1. G. C. Anawati, "The Roman Catholic Church and Churches in Communion with Rome," in *Religion in the Middle East* 1, ed. A. J. Arberry (1969), 351, 374. See also John Green, *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus,* Part 11, which contains an account of the "Maronite Nation inhabiting the Mountain of Lebanon," p. 94.
2. William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Seas* 11, trans. into English by A. Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York, 1943), 458–59. Other writers like Jacques de Vitry (d. 1240) do not add any significant information about the Maronites. See Jacques de Vitry, *The History of Jerusalem,* trans. into English by Aubery Stewart in *Palestine Pilgrim's Text Society* 11 (London, 1896), 79–80. See also John Green, *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus,* Part 11, 97–104, where Green provides the account of William of Tyre together with the account of de Vitry about the Maronites. He relates that the Maronites accuse William of Tyre of copying Ibn Batriq whose account about the Maronites is "chargeable with ignorance and falsehood."
3. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 352, and Crawford, "William of Tyre," 223. See also Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 244–247, and John Green, *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus,* Part 11, 97–104.
4. Robert C. Crawford, "William of Tyre," 228.
5. Kamal S. Salibi, "The Maronites of Lebanon under Frankish and Mamluk Rule 1099–1516," *Arabica* 4 (1957), 290–96.
6. See this letter of al-Qilaᶜi in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 282, 354–55; Masᶜad, *al-Durr al-Manzum,* 151; and al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 161–63, 268. Salibi relates this episode by al-Qilaᶜi but without making an effort to substantiate its authenticity. See Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 16.
7. See al-Qilaᶜi's letter in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 354–55.
8. For this letter of Pope Paul II see Quaresmio, *Historica, Theologia,* 324–26; Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 24; al-Qilaᶜi, *Marun al-Tubani,* Vatican Garshuni MS 640, pp. 34–35; and al-Ghaziri, *Rome Et L'Église Syrienne-Maronite,* 114–17.
9. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* 111, 67. For the speech made by Giovanni Battista Eliano, papal delegate to the Maronites, at the meeting of the Maronite Church Council, August 1–16, see Louis Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya wa al-Ruhbaniyya al-Yasuᶜiyya," *al-Mashriq* 18 (1920), 305.
10. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 370.
11. For the life and policies of Pope Innocent 111, see Horace Mann, *The Lives of the*

Popes 12, entire Chapter 12.

12. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 2–6; al-Ghaziri, *Rome El L' Église Syrienne-Maronite,* 96–102; and the Arabic translation of the same, 103–106. For a substantial portion of the Latin text as well as Arabic translation of this letter see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 257–59; al-Qilaᶜi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 27–29; and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 361–65. Horace Mann, *The Lives of the Popes* 12, 68–71 produces English translation of only excerpts of this letter.

13. See sources in the previous footnote and Francesco Suriano, who states that the Maronites remained in error until Pope Innocent 111, sent them Messer Pietro of Amalfi, Cardinal Priest of the title of Saint Mark. Suriano means Cardinal Peter of Saint Marcellus. See Francesco Suriano, *Il trattato di Terra Santa e dell' Orient,* ed. Girolamo Golubovich (Milan, 1900), 70–71. See also the English translation of this work entitled *Treatise On The Holy Land,* translated by Theophilus Bellorini and Eugene Hoade with a preface and notes by Bellarmino Bagatti (Jerusalem, 1949), 81, together with footnote 3.

14. See the *Zajaliyya* of al-Qilaᶜi in Dayr Mar Dumit Garshuni MS 454, pp. 1–29, and *Mukhtasar Tarikh Jabra'il al-Qilaᶜi al-Lihfidi (Compendium History of Jabra'il al-Qilaᶜi of Lihfid)* in Antonius Aynturini's *al-Tarikh al-Wajiz (Compendious History)* in Bibliothèque Orientale Université de St. Joseph Arabic MS 47, pp. 55–59. Aynturini rewrote al-Qilaᶜi's *Zajaliyya* in prose and incorporated it into his *Compendious History.* Another prose version of the same *Zajaliyya* is found in Bibliothèque Orientale Arabic MS 57, pp. 15–19. See also al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 368–370; Faustus Nairon, *Evoplia fidei,* 101; and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal* 199.

15. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 370.

16. This confusion is obvious from the events al-Qilaᶜi relates in his *Zajaliyya* which presumably took place in the time of Patriarch al-Dimlisawi, although his name is not mentioned. For al-Qilaᶜi see above note 14. On the confusion of early Maronite writers between al-Amshiti and al-Dimlisawi see Yusuf Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* p. 35.

17. See *Mukhtasar Tarikh al-Qilaᶜi* in Aynturini, *al-Tarikh al-Wajiz,* 56–57. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 370–71, quoting in passim al-Qilaᶜi's letter to the Patriarch Shimᶜun al-Hadathi about al-Amshiti's journey to Rome. See also al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 198–99. Cf. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 29–30.

18. See al-Qilaᶜi in Bibliothèque Orientale Arabic MS 47, p. 57 and his letter to Patriarch Shimᶜun al-Hadathi in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 371.

19. For this letter see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 2–6. An Arabic translation of the same is in al-Qilaᶜi's, *Marun al-Tubani,* 27–29, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 361–65. For both Latin and Arabic translations of this letter see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 257–59.

20. Masᶜad, *al-Durr al-Manzum,* 31–32, 66–67, 133–35 of the appendix, and by the same author his treatise affirming that the Maronite patriarch is the "Patriarch of Antioch" to the exclusion of other patriarchs who claim the same title in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 283–87.

21. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 2–6; al-Qilaᶜi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 27–29; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 361–65; and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 257–59.

22. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 4–5; al-Qilaᶜi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 27–29; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 362–64, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 257–59. See also the minutes of the Lebanese Council assembled in 1736, contained in the Bibliothèque Orientale, St. Joseph Université Arabic MS 537, 336–38. The portion of Innocent III's letter ordering the Maronites to use brass or steel church bells contradicts the statement of al-Duwayhi that since 1212 the Maronites of Lebanon had begun to use brass instead of wooden bells.

See al-Duwayhi *Tarikh,* 103, and by the same author *Tarikh al-Azmina,* ed. Ferdinand Toautel al-Yasuʿi (Beirut, 1951), 22.

23. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 4–5; al-Qilaʿi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 27–29; al-Duwayhi, *Ibid.,* and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 257–59.

24. Ibid.

25. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 365–67, and al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 158–60.

26. For a challenge of these opinions, particularly of Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs regarding this portion of the letter of Pope Innocent III, see Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 264–77.

27. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 4, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 263. Dawud states that he personally searched for this letter which he found written on a vellum at the Vatican Library.

28. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 53, for the letter of Pope Clement VII, and pp. 70–72 for the letter of Pope Gregory XIII. See also Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 263–64.

29. Bulus Qara'ali, in *al-Majalla al-Suriyya al-Patriarchiyya* 5 (1930), 519, quoted by Philip Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan ʿan Tarikh Lebnan wa Safha min Akhbar al-Suryan (The Most True Account of the History of Lebanon and a Page of the Chronicles of the Syrian)* 1 (Beirut, 1948), 74.

30. See sources in above note 14.

31. Qara'ali in *al-Majalla al-Suriyya al-Patriarchiyya* 6 (1931), 37, quoted by Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 77.

32. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 375; Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 19; and by the same author, "The Maronite Church in the Middle Ages and its Union with Rome," *al-Nahar* 42 (1958), 92–104.

33. See al-Dimlisawi's marginal note in the *Biblioteca Medicia* Syriac MS 1, p. 17, in which he states that the Amir (prince) of Jubayl and the bishops made him patriarch and sent him to Rome. See also Yusuf Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 34. Cf. Kamal S. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 19, where the author states that the Franks "sent Irmia al-Dimlisawi to Rome immediately after his election to obtain confirmation."

34. See Qara'ali in *al-Majalla al-Suriyya al-Patriarchiyya* 5 (1931), 40, quoted by Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 77.

35. It would be very useful to read the three volumes of Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* in order to appreciate the position and influence of the Syrian Orthodox Church and community in Lebanon.

36. Henri Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon wa Jabal Lebnan fi al-Qarn al-Khamis Ashar" *(Fra Gryphon and the Mount of Lebanon in the Fifteenth Century), al-Mashriq* 1 (1899), 56. The title of de Suchem's book is *Itinere Hierosolymitane,* which Lammens describes as a very old and rare book in Vienna having neither date nor place of publication, and no pagination.

37. See al-Qilaʿi's *Zajaliyya* in Mar Dumit Garshuni MS 454, pp. 7–8; *Mukhtasar Tarikh al-Qilaʿi* in Aynturini, *al-Tarikh al-Wajiz,* 55–57; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 368, and particularly 379 regarding the faith of the patriarch Luqa al-Banhrani; and Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 230–31.

38. Al-Qilaʿi, *Zajaliyya,* 7–8; *Mukhtasar Tarikh al-Qilaʿi* 55 and 58; Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 83.

39. Al-Qilaʿi, *Zajaliyya,* 7–8, and Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 83.

40. Ibid.

41. Qara'ali in *al-Majalla al-Suriyya al-Patriarchiyya* 6 (1931), 40, quoted by Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 77–78.

42. Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 78 footnote. The Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Mar Ignatius Yaʿqub III, has kindly provided me with a list of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchs of Antioch but it contains no patriarch by the name of Luqa al-Banhrani. Al-Duwayhi states that he could not find information regarding al-Banhrani because of lack of Maronite sources in the thirteenth century and because the Maronites were constantly engaged in wars at that time.

43. See this quotation in Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 58. For the French version of this article see Henri Lammens, S.I., "Fra Gryphon et le Libanon au XV Siècle," a *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* 4 (1899).

44. Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 59, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 111.

45. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh al-Azmina,* 126, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 227. According to both al-Duwayhi and al-Dibs a letter of Pope Alexander to Shimʿun 11, conferring upon him the title of patriarch is among the archives of the Maronite patriarchate. However, al-Qilaʿi does not record this letter in his *Marun al-Tubani.*

46. On the events which led to the union of Constantinople with Rome at the Council of Florence, see L. Bréhier, "Attempts at Reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches," *Cambridge Medieval History* 4, planned by J. Bury (New York, 1936), Chapter 19, pp. 619–26; M. Jugie, *Le Schisme byzantin apercue, historique et doctrinale* (Paris, 1941), 264–70; A. A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* 2 (University of Wisconsin Press, 1964), 672–74; and Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge, 1959), Chapters 4–8, pp. 180–304.

47. For this letter of Pope Eugene IV, to the Maronite Patriarch Yuhanna (John) al-Jaji (d. 1445), see al-Qilaʿi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 30–31; al-Dwuayhi, *Tarikh,* 390–92; al-Ghaziri, *Rome Et L' Eglise Syrienne-Maronite,* 109–110.

48. See the part entitled "Thabat al-Sidq" in al-Qilaʿi's *Marun al-Tubani,* 39–96, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 388–90.

49. For this letter see al-Qilaʿi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 32–34, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 390–92. Al-Ghaziri, *Rome Et L'Eglise Syrienne-Maronite,* 109–110; and Gill, *The Council of Florence,* 336.

50. Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 15; and Gill, *The Council of Florence,* 336.

51. For this papal bull see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 14–16; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 395–96; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 11, 540, and Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 1, 523.

52. Ibid., and Gill, *The Council of Florence,* 336–37.

53. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 14–16; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 395–96; Hefele, *History of the Councils* 11, 540. Cf. Gill, *The Council of Florence,* 337.

54. Ibid.

55. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 395–97.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid.

58. Gill, *The Council of Florence,* 336–37.

22—THE MISSION OF FRA GRYPHON AND OTHER FRANCISCANS TO THE MARONITES

1. Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 13, and Suriano *Il trattato di Terra Santa e dell Oriente,* ed. by Girolamo Golubovich (Milan, 1900), 68–71, and the English translation of the same, Francesco Suriano, *Treatise On The Holy Land,* trans. into English by Theophilus Bellorini and Eugene Hoade with a preface and notes by Bellarmino Bagatti

(Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1949), 81–84. See also Siméon Vailhé, "Fra Suriano et al Perpetuell Orthodoxie Des Maronites," *Echos d'Orient* 7 (Paris, 1904), 101–102. An Arabic translation of this passage is appended to Dawud's, *Kitab Jamiᶜ al-Hujaj,* 512–14.

2. Lemmens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 59–60.

3. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 399–411, in which the author refutes what he considers the allegation of Bishop Marcus of Lisbon. The statement that Fra Gryphon became a patriarch of the Maronites is historically groundless. For more information on this subject see Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 127–28.

4. Green, *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus,* Part 11, 106.

5. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 406–408.

6. Suriano, *Il trattato di Terra Santa,* 70–71, and p. 82 of the English translation.

7. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 406.

8. For this letter see al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 406–408.

9. Ibid, 408.

10. For the letter of Pope Paul II to the Maronite patriarch Butrus al-Hadathi see Quaresmio, *Historica, Theologia,* 1 (Venice, 1880) 324–26; Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 22–25; and al-Qilaᶜi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 34–35; al-Ghaziri, *Rome Et L'Eglise Syrienne-Maronite,* 114–17.

11. Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 58–60.

12. Ibid., 60.

13. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 141, 415–16; Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 60; and Kamal S. Salibi, "The Muqaddams of Bsharri 1382–1621," *Arabica* 15 (1968), 63–86.

14. Lammens, "al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon," 56

15. Ibid., 60, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 141, 415–16.

16. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 415.

17. Of these villages we may mention Bsharri, Lihfid, Hardin, Ihden, Ayn Turin and Hadshith. Cf. al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 415.

18. Ibid., 440–41.

19. Ibid., 139–42, and by the same author *Tarikh al-Azmina,* 214, 217–18.

20. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 141, and by the same author *Tarikh al-Azmina,* 217–18; and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiᶜ al-Mufassal,* 247–49 who follows al-Duwahyhi.

21. Nuh of Baqufa or al-Baqufi, a Maronite convert, became a dignitary of the Syrian Orthodox Church. In 1480 he was ordained a bishop of Hims assuming the name of Cyril at his ordination. In 1489 he was elevated to the office of Maphrian. In 1493 he was chosen a patriarch of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch. He died on July 28, 1509. See Ignatius Afram Barsoum, *al-Lu'lu al-Manthur,* 565–66.

22. For this part of al-Qilaᶜi's *Zajaliyya,* see al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 418.

23. Ibid., 141–42, 415–16, and by the same author, *Tarikh al-Azmina,* 214, 217, 219.

24. Ibid.

25. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 415.

26. Ibid., 417.

27. Ibid., 141–42, 415–17, and by the same author *Tarikh al-Azmina,* 214, 217–19.

28. Suriano mentions these three men, one of whom was al-Qilaᶜi. He states that these men whom he knew personally joined the Franciscan Order and were sent to Venice to study canon law. See Suriano, *Il trattato di Terra Santa,* 69–71, and pp. 82–84 of the English translation entitled *Treatise on the Holy Land.* Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 139, 412, states that al-Qilaᶜi completed his education in Rome.

29. Al-Qilaᶜi, *Zajaliyya,* 1–29; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 418–420; and Tarrazi, *Asdaq*

ma Kan, entire Chapter 3.

30. Suriano, *Il trattato di Terra Santa*, 71, and p. 84 of the English translation.

31. Vailhé, "Fra Suriano," 100, and Rev. Bellarmino Bagatti's preface to *Treatise on the Holy Land*, 1–17.

32. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 427.

33. Ibid., 428.

34. For this letter of Pope Leo X to the Maronites see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum*, 25–29, and al-Qilaʿi, *Marun al-Tubani*, 35–37. A summary of this letter is found in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 429. Of interest is the pope's letter to the Maronite patriarch in which he calls the Maronites a "rose among thorns and infidelity." See Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum*, 47.

35. Ibid.

36. Neale, *History of the Holy Eastern Church*, 154.

37. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 440, and the Chorepiscopus Butrus Ghalib, "Nawabigh al-Madrasa al-Maruniyya al-Ula," (Prominent Graduates of the First Maronite School), *al-Mashriq* 22 (1924), 350, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal*, 290.

38. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 439–40.

39. Ibid., 440.

40. Ibid., 440–41.

41. Ibid., 441.

42. Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan*, 11, 102–107.

43. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum*, 70–72, and al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 441. Portions of the Latin text of this letter are reproduced by Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj*, 418.

44. Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum*, 71–72.

45. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj*, 419.

23—THE MISSION OF GIOVANNI BATTISTA ELIANO TO THE MARONITES

1. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 442.

2. Giorgio Levi Della Vida, *Ricerche Sulla Formazione Del Piu Antico Fondo Manoscritti Orientali Della Biblioteca Vaticana*, Studi E. Testi: 92 (Citta Del Vaticana, 1939), 193–94.

3. Ibid., 194. For the Pope's letter to Eliano and Raggio see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum*, 74–75.

4. For the letter of Cardinal Caraffa see Anton Rabbath, *Documents inédits Pour Servir a l' histoire du Christianisme en Orient* 1 (Paris-Lepzig, 1905–1910), 140–44.

5. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 442, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal*, 292–93.

6. Louis Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 17 (1919), 454, and vol. 18 (1920), 678.

7. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 442–43.

8. Ibid., 443.

9. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 17, 762.

10. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh*, 442–44, and Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 29.

11. Al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj*, 243, and Thomas à Jesu (Tomas de Jesus), *De Procuranda Salute Omnium Gentium*, 1st ed. (Rome, 1613), Book 111, Chapter 6.

12. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 66–67.

13. Ibid., 67.

14. Rabbath, *Documents inédits,* 145–51, and Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 68.

15. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 444.

16. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 302–303.

17. Ibid., 306–308, and Rabbath, *Documents inédits,* 152–269.

18. Rabbath, *Documents inédits,* 152–269, and Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 676–77. In his *Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis Canonici et Civilis* 5, 521, Assemani states that he had in his possession the original Latin copy of the minutes of the Council of Qanubin assembled in August 1580, as well as an Arabic translation made by Giovanni Battista Eliano completed on September 20, 1580. This Arabic version was transcribed by the Chorepiscopus Yuhanna al-Hasruni. For an Arabic summary of the acts of this Council see al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 302–305.

19. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 678.

20. Ibid., 679.

21. Ibid., 768.

22. This is at present at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris No. 225 listed under the name of Abu Ishaq Ibn al-Assal. See Georg Graf, *Geschichte Der Christlichen,* 402.

23. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 679.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., 307.

26. Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 127–28. Tarrazi provides a short biography of Bishop Muhanna and states that Muhanna's family later joined the Maronite Church.

27. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 680. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 444 is incorrect in stating that the patriarch passed away in 1580.

28. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 440, and Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 584–86.

29. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 969.

30. Ibid., vol. 9 (1921), 140–41.

31. Thomas à Jesu, *De Procuranda Salute,* Book 111, Chapter 6. See also al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj,* 6. Al-Duwayhi's apology is directed against what he considers the "Tuham" (accusations) leveled by Giovanni Battista Eliano against the errors Eliano found in Maronite ritual books. The same apology is directed against Thomas à Jesu who has incorporated these errors in his above mentioned book.

32. Al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj,* 4. The names of these two young men are mentioned in Vatican Latin MS 55528, pp. 31–33, quoted by Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 9, 143.

33. Al-Duwayhi, Ibid.

34. For a description of the notebooks written by Eliano see al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj,* 242–46, and Thomas à Jesu, *De Procuranda Salute,* Book 111, Chapter 6.

35. Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 307.

36. Al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj,* 242–46.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid., 21–24.

39. Ibid., 63–64.

40. Ibid., 28. For an evidence that Jacob of Sarug was a Syrian Orthodox "Monophysite" see above Chapter 14, note 9.

41. Al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj,* 4–6, 244–46.

42. Ibid. A strong proof that Eliano's knowledge of Arabic was adequate is his ability to translate from Latin into Arabic the acts of the Council of Qanubin assembled in August, 1580. See above note 18 of this chapter.

43. Al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijai,* 244, 246.
44. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 442.
45. For this school see Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 9, 141, 146, 293–302, 625–30, and Jerome Labourt, "Maronites," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 9, ed. Charles G. Herbermann, (New York, 1913), 687.

24—THE MISSION OF JEROME DANDINI TO THE MARONITES

1. See Girolamo Dandini, *Missione apostolica al patriarca e Maroniti del monte Libano. E sus Pellegrinazione a Gierusalemme* (Cesena, 1656). There are several English translations of Dandini's account of his journey to Lebanon. The translation used here is *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon wherein is an account of the customs, and manners &c., of the Turks. Also a description of Candia, Nicosia, Tripoli, Alexandretta &c., written originally in Italian,* in Pinkerton, John, editor, *A General Collection of the best and most interesting Voyages and Travels* 10 (London, 1811), 272–304. For the letter of Pope Clement VIII delegating Dandini to the Maronites see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 106.
2. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 273.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., 287.
5. Ibid., 287.
6. Ibid., 288.
7. Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 440.
8. For these letters of Patriarch Sarkis al-Ruzzi see Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Marniyya," vol. 18, 29, 53–54, and vol. 9, 302, 630.
9. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 295.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., 295. An Arabic summary of these "errors" are in al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 306.
12. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 295.
13. Ibid., 295–96.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid., 296.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., 296–297, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 307–309.
18. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 297.
19. Ibid., 295.
20. Ibid.
21. Al-Duwayhi, *Ihtijaj,* 182–83.
22. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 297.
23. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 174–77, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 324–28, where the author disproves the Maronites' allegation that the "Jacobites" distorted Maronite books.
24. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 297.
25. Ibid., 295.
26. Ibid., 297.
27. See above Chapter 8.
28. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 295.

29. Photius, *Bibliotheca* in *Patrologia Graeca* 102, 958, and Deryan, *Lubab al-Barahin,* 97, footnote 1.

30. Dandini, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon,* 295.

31. Masʿad, *al-Durr al-Manzum,* 31–32, 66–67, 133–35 of the appendix. See also by the same author his treatise affirming that the Maronite patriarch is "the Patriarch of Antioch" in al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 283–87.

32. For this letter see Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 4.

33. Al-Dibs, *Ruh al-Rudud,* 283.

34. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes,* 64–65.

35. Yuhanna Badhinjana, *Mir'at al-Haqq al-Wadiyya,* 67, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 76. See also Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East,* 169, footnote 19.

36. See for example the instructions of Pope Gregory XIII, and Cardinal Caraffa to Giovanni Battista Eliano and Thomas Raggio as delegates to the Maronites, where both the pope and the cardinal address Patriarch Mikha'il al-Ruzzi as "Patriarch of the Maronites." Cf. Rabbath, *Documents inédits,* 140, and Anaissi, *Bullarium Maronitarum,* 73–78.

37. Lequien, *Oriens Christianus* 111, 50, and Dawud, *Kitab Jamiʿ al-Hujaj,* 53–54. In his letter to the Maronite Patriarch Yaʿqub al-Hadathi in 1490, Pope Paul II, states that the title "Patriarch of Antioch" was conferred upon the Maronite patriarchs by deference of the previous popes. For this letter of Pope Paul II, see al-Qilaʿi, *Marun al-Tubani,* 34, and Badhinjana, *Mir'at al-Haqq al-Wadiyya,* 27–28.

38. See the acts of the Lebanese Council (1736) in Bibliothèque Orientale Arabic MS 537, Part 3, Chapter 6, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul Harisa Arabic MS 106, p. 333.

39. Ibid.

40. See above Chapter 16 and relevant notes.

25—THE LATINIZATION OF THE MARONITE CHURCH

1. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 105.

2. Ibid., 104.

3. Ibid., 105.

4. See *Mukhtasar Tarikh al-Qilaʿi* in Aynturini, *al-Tarikh al-Wajiz* 53, and al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 299.

5. These six canons were published by Rashid al-Shartuni in *al-Mashriq* 7 (1904), 689–93. See also Cheikho, "al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya," vol. 18, 696, and vol. 19, 769. Regarding the adoption of the Gregorian Calendar by Patriarch Yusuf al-Ruzzi see the Chorepiscopus Yusuf Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina* (Beirut, 1957), 49.

6. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 50.

7. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 108.

8. Ibid., 110.

9. J. C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East* 1 (Princeton, 1956), 24. For al-Shidrawi's mission see Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis,* 552–53. For an Arabic translation of the document of Louis XIV, placing the Maronites under French protection, see al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 359–60.

10. F. Charles-Roux, *France et Chrétiens d' Orient* (Paris, 1939), 48–55, and Daghir, Batarikat al-Mawarina, 58.

11. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 34.

12. See the introduction to al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 18, which contains his short biogra-

phy by the Maronite Patriarch Simʿan Awwad (d. 1756).

13. The Chorepiscopus Mikha'il al-Rajji, "Fi al-Taqs al-Maruni," *al-Mashriq* 33 (1935), 494–505.

14. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 119.

15. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 62.

16. Ibid.

17. See for instance Rev. George Percy Badger, *The Nestorians and Their Rituals* 1 (London, 1952), 167–77. The author was an eye witness who relates how the Chaldeans succumbed to the authority of Rome and that some of their bishops resented the activities of Latin missionaries amongst them. I have in my possession a copy of a nineteenth-century Arabic manuscript entitled *Nubdha Qadimat al-Athar fi Akhbar Kaldan al-Malabar (A Tractate Containing Ancient Chronicles of the Chaldeans of Malabar).* It was written in 1850 by the Metropolitan Abd Yeshue Khayyat al-Bazzuʿi (later patriarch of the Chaldeans), while he was still a priest. There are two more copies of this manuscript, one at the Chaldean Patriarchate in Baghdad, Iraq; the other at the Iraqi Museum Library MS 1092. Cf. Rev. Butrus Haddad, "al-Patriarch Jirjis Abd Yeshue al-Khamis Khayyat," *Bayn al-Nahrayn* 11, nos. 41–42 (Mosul, 1983), 92. Page 80–115 of this manuscript contain a letter written by Butrus Ibn Tatar, metropolitan of Seʿert to the Chaldean congregation in Mosul, Iraq, criticizing the activities of Latin missionaries and their intention to Latinize and subjugate the Chaldeans Church to the authority of Rome.

18. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 131.

19. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 6–8; *Relazione dell' ablegazione apostolica alla nazione de' Maronite nella Siria, e Monte Libano di Monsignor Guiseppe Simonio Assemani alla S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* (Rome, 1741), 2–4; Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 66; and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 131. See also the Arabic version of the report which Assemani sent to Pope Clement XII, dated January 17, 1737, in al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 493–95.

20. See *Relazione,* 9–10; Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 66; and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 132. See also Labourt, "Maronites," 687–88, where the author states that with great difficulty Assemani was able to overcome the "ill will of the patriarch and the intrigue of the bishops," p. 688.

21. See the acts of the Lebanese Council in the Bibliothèque Orientale, Université St. Joseph Arabic MS 537, Part 11, Chapter 12, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, Harisa Arabic MS 106, pp. 118–19. MS 537 is not paginated, while MS 106 is paginated.

22. Bibliothèque Orientale MS 647, Part 11, Chapter 2, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul MS 106, p. 36.

23. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 11, Chapter 2, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, p. 38.

24. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 11, Chapter 4, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, p. 73.

25. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 11, Chapter 12, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, p. 120.

26. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 11, Chapter 12, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, p. 156.

27. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 111, Chapter 6, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, p. 286.

28. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 111, Chapter 6, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, p. 286. See also A. A. Stamouli, "Maronites," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* 11, ed. Samuel Macauley Jackson (1958), 189.

29. Bibliothèque Orientale, MS 537, Part 111, Chapter 6, and Bibliothèque de St. Paul, MS 106, pp. 289–91.

30. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 133. Bishop Dib provides additional information about the controversy over mixed monasteries. See also Labourt, "Maronites," 688.

31. For the names of there monasteries see Assemani's letter to Pope Clement XII in al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 495. See also Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 133.

32. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 144.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid., 136–37.

35. See the Arabic translation of the memorandum of Pope Benedict XIV, confirming the acts of the Lebanese Council appended to the Bibliothèque Orientale Arabic MS 537.

36. For this Council of Louisa see al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 562–64, and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 161–66.

37. Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 162–63.

38. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 96–97, and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 161–66.

39. Al-Dibs, *al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal,* 438–42; Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 67–68 and Dib, *History of the Maronite Church,* 138–42.

40. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 127–31, especially pp. 129–30, where the author quotes the letter of Pope Pius XII in which he chose and instituted al-Maʿushi as a patriarch.

41. See the acts of the Lebanese Council in the Bibliothèque Orientale Arabic MS 537, Part 11, Chapter 12, and the Bibliothèque de St. Paul, Harisa Arabic MS 106, pp. 146–47.

42. Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma Kan,* 2–4.

43. Beggiani, *A Brief History,* 1.

44. For a comparison between the liturgy of Sharar and that of Addai and Mari, see Rahmani, *al-Mabahith al-Jaliyya,* 411–33. Rahmani's opinion that Sharar is a Maronite liturgy is unconvincing and historically groundless.

45. Beggiani, *A Brief History,* 1–47.

46. See *The Maronite Rite: A Catechism,* ed. Msgr. Joseph Abi Nader (Maronite Apostolic Exarchate, 1972), p. 15.

47. Ibid., 19.

48. Ibid., 18–19.

49. Ibid., 14.

50. Johannes M. Hoeck, "Decrees On Eastern Catholic Churches," trans. into English by Lalit Adolphus in *Commentary On The Documents of Vatican II* 11 (New York, 1967), 307–327.

51. Nader, *The Maronite Rite* 15.

52. Ibid.

53. See the leaflet written by Rev. Ronald Beshara entitled *A Church On The Move: Liturgical Reform in the Diocese of Saint Maron.*

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid.

56. Beggiani, *A Brief History,* 138–139.

57. Beshara, *A Church On The Move.*

26—THE MARONITES IN MODERN TIMES

1. William of Tyre, Book 22, Chapter 8, in *Patrologia Latina* 201 (1855), 855; Yusuf Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan,* I, 200–201; and Salibi, "The Maronites of Lebanon, 290–96.

2. See above Chapter 3 where we have elaborated the opinions of Rev. Daww.

3. See above Chapters 14 and 15.

4. See above Chapter 14, and Abd al-Aziz Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya min Tarikh Lebnan* (Beirut: Jami'at Beirut, 1974), document no. 15, pp. 79–80, and by the same author, "Tatawwur Lebnan al-Siyasi wa al-Ijtima'i" in *al-Azma al-Lebnaniyya, Usuluha, Tatawwruha, Ab'aduha al-Mukhtalifa* (Cairo, 1978), 14.

5. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina* 45–46.

6. Ibid., 46.

7. Ahmad Ibn Muhammad al-Khalidi, *Lebnan fi Ahd al-Amir Fakhr al-Din al-Thani wa huwa Kitab Tarikh al-Amir Fakhr al-Din al-Ma'ni* (Beirut, 1936), 32, 36; Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 26; Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 52.

8. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 52–54, and Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan al-Am* I, 318–30.

9. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 52, and Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya,* 14.

10. I. Harik, *Politics and Change in Traditional Society 1711–1845* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1962), 227–35.

11. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh al-Azmina,* 329, and Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan al-Am,* I, 359–63.

12. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* between pp. 52 and 53.

13. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 56.

14. Toufic Touma, *Paysans et institutions feodales chez les Druzes et les Maronites du Liban-du XVme siecle* (1914), 47–49; William Polk, *The Opening of Southern Lebanon 1788–1870: A Study of the Impact of the West on the Middle East* (Cambridge, 1963), 14–26, 48–52, 72–73; and Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya,* 14.

15. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 32.

16. Al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh,* 375.

17. Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya,* 84–86, document no. 17.

18. C. H. Churchill, *The Druze and the Maronite under the Turkish Rule 1840–1860* (reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1973), 20.

19. Tannus al-Shidyaq, *Akhbar al-A'yan fi Jabal Lebnan* (Beirut, 1859), 375.

20. Haydar al-Shihabi, *Lebnan fi Ahd al-Umara al-Shihabiyyin* (Beirut: al-Hukuma al-Lebnaniyya Press, 1933), part 1, pp. 42, 68, 106.

21. Al-Shihabi, *Lebnan fi Ahd al-Umara,* part 11, pp. 415–16, 512–15.

22. Harik, *Politics and Change in Traditional Society,* 131–34.

23. Ibid., 136–39.

24. Ibid., and Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya,* 14–15.

25. For these massacres see Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan al-Am,* I, 550–57.

26. Adel Ismail, *Histoire du Liban au a nos jours* 1 (Paris, 1955), 213–18, and Abd al-Aziz Nawwar, "Tatawwur Lebnan al-Siyasi Mundhu Nihayat al-Hukm al-Misri hatta Hawadith al-Santayn 1840–1860," in *al-Azma al-Lebnaniyya* (Cairo, 1968), 94–104.

27. Ismail, *Histoire du Liban,* 270–76.

28. Albert H. Hourani, *Syria and Lebanon* (Oxford University Press, 1954), 31, and Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya,* 102–104.

29. Hourani, *Syria and Lebanon,* 32, and Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 97–98.

30. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 99, and Nawwar, *Watha'iq Asasiyya,* 109–110. On this period see Ahmad Tarbin, *Azmat al-Hukm fi Lebnan Mundhu Suqut al-Usra al-Shihabiyya hatta Ibtida Ahd al-Mutasarrifiyya, 1842–1861* (Damascus, 1966); Anton Dahir *al-Aqiqi, Thawra wa Fitna fi Lebnan* (Beirut, 1939); and A. J. Abraham, *Lebanon at Mid-Century Maronite Druze Relation in Lebanon 1840–1860* (University Press of America, 1981) 101–110.

31. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 99–100, J. C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East* 1 (Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1956), 163–64, and Muzhir, *Tarikh Lebnan al-Am,* I, 633–80.

32. Salibi, "al-Mawarina," 40, and J. P. Spagnolo, "Constitutional Changes in Mount Lebanon 1861–1864, *Middle Eastern Studies* 7 (1971), 25–47, and Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 99–101.

33. Muhammad Abd al-Ra'uf Salim, "Mutasarrifiyyat Lebnan," in *al-Azma al-Lebnaniyya* (1978), 127–71; Salibi, *al-Mawarina,* 42; and Abd al-Aziz Abd al-Ghani Ibrahim "al-Alaqat al-Suriyya al-Lebnaniyya hatta Am 1958," in *al-Azma al-Lebnaniyya* (1978), 545–48.

34. Hourani, *Syria and Lebanon,* 33.

35. Salah al-Aqqad, "Takwin Lebnan al-Hadith," in *al-Azma al-Lebnaniyya,* 178–92.

36. Ibid., 181, and Fadl Shalaq, *al-Ta'ifiyya wa al-Harb al-Ahliyya fi Lebnan* (Beirut: Dar al-Haqiqa, 1978), 32–39.

37. David Kerr, "The Temporal Authority of the Maronite Patriarchs: 1919–1958" (Ph.D. diss: St. Antony College, Oxford University, 1978), in passim.

38. Joseph Sabʿali, "al-Madmun al-Ta'ifi li Mithaq 1943," in *Nadwat al-Fikr al-Watani fi Muwajahat al-Mushkila al-Ta'ifiyya* (Beirut: Majallat Fikr, 1981) 161.

39. Najla Atiyya, *Lebnan: al-Mushkila wa al-Ma'sat* (Beirut, 1977), 28.

40. Ibid., 28–29.

41. For more information on this subject see Michael Hudson, *The Precious Republic* (New York: Random House, 1968), and L. Meo, *Lebnon: Implorable Nation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1958).

42. George Dib, "The National Pact of Lebanon: Translations from a speech by Riadh Sulh, October, 1943," *The Middle East Forum* 34 (January, 1959), 6–7, and Ephraim A. Frankel, "The Maronite Patriarch: An Historical View of a Religious Zaʿim in the 1958 Lebanese Crisis" *The Muslim World* 66, no. 3 (October, 1976), 220–221; al-Aqqad, "Takwin Lebnan al-Hadith," 202–204, and Yahya al-Jamal "al-Mithaq al-Watani wa al-Nizam al-Dusturi fi Lebnan," in *al-Azma al-Lebnaniyya,* 209–221.

43. See for example Fadl Shalaq, al-Ta'ifiyya, 39–44; Michel Ghurayyib, *al-Ta'ifiyya wa al-Iqtaʿiyya fi Lebnan,* 2nd. ed. (Beirut, 1964), 48–52; and by the same author *al-Salibiyyun al-Lebnaniyyun* (Beirut, 1975–1976), 120–22.

44. Ghurayyib, *al-Salibiyyun al-Lebnaniyyun,* 120–21, and Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 123.

45. See the proclamation of al-Rabita al-Maruniyya in *al-Nahar,* no. 22 (Beirut: June 1975), and Ghurayyib, *al-Ta'ifiyya,* 158–59.

46. See *Haliyyat* 1 (Beirut: April, 1977), 22–50. For another opinion of prominent Maronites see ibid. 11 (1977), 18–27, which contains the opinion of Pierre Jumayyil regarding the National Pact, and 13 (1979), 275–82.

47. Daghir, *Batarikat al-Mawarina,* 123.

48. Anis Sayigh, *Lebnan al-Ta'ifi* (Beirut: Dar al-Siraʿal-Fikri, 1955), quoted by Ghurayyib, *al-Ta'ifiyya,* 78.

49. Bishara al-Khuri, *Haqa'iq Lebnaniyya* 1 (Beirut: Manshurat Awraq Lebnaniyya,

1960), quoted in Ghurayyib, *al-Ta'ifiyya,* 76–77.

50. Ephraim Frankel, in *The Muslim World* 66 (October, 1970), 221–22.

51. See the pro-Maronite newspaper *al-Bayraq,* dated March 13, 1956, and Frankel, *The Muslim World,* 222.

52. *The Arab World,* Beirut, February 2, 1957.

53. Frankel, *The Muslim World,* 224.

54. *Beirut al-Masa,* dated February 16, 1958.

55. *Al-Bayraq,* dated February 24 and 25, 1958.

56. *The Arab World,* April 22, 1958, and Frankel, *The Mulsim World,* 250.

57. *The Arab World,* May 26, 1958, and Frankel, *The Muslim World,* 251.

58. *Beirut al-Masa,* August 8, 1958, and Frankel, *The Muslim World,* 254.

59. Ghurayyib, *al-Ta'ifiyya,* 79–80.

60. *Al-Sayyad,* March 10-17, 1977. See the same in *Haliyyat* 1 (Beirut, 1977), 54–56.

61. These seventeen communities are Sunnite Muslims, Shiite Muslims, Alawis (Nusayris), Ismaʿilis, Druze, Jewish, Maronite, Greek Orthodox, Greek Catholic, Armenian Orthodox, Armenian Catholic, Chaldean, Nestorian, Syrian Orthodox, Syrian Catholic, Latin, and Protestant. See the Annual of *al-Nahar* for Christmas-New Years, 1972–1973, and *Religion, State and Ideology* Report of the Center for the Study of the Modern Arab World for 1975, 111 (Beirut: St. Joseph University, 1976), 1.

62. These and other reasons for the Lebanese crises are fully discussed in Nassar Ghalamiyya, *Asbab wa Asrar al-Harb al-Lebnaniyya* (Beirut, 1976).

63. See the interview of Raymond Edde by Fu'ad Hubayqa in *al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443, August 15, 1985, p. 28.

64. Ghalamiyya, *Asbab wa Asrar,* 353–55, and Camille Shamoun *Azma fi Lebnan* (Beirut, 1977), 145–56, containing the text of the Cairo and the Malcart agreements.

65. John Bulloch, *Death of a Country: The Civil War in Lebanon* (London, 1977), 75–89; Shamoun, *Azma fi Lebnan,* where the author provides a daily diary of the progress of the conflicts; and *al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443, August 15, 1985, p. 27.

66. Bulloch, *Death of a Country,* 79.

67. Ibid.

68. *Al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443, August 15, 1985, p. 29.

69. Jonathan Randal, *Going all the Way: Christian Warlords, Israeli Adventurers and the War in Lebanon* (Viking, 1983), 118–19, and *al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443, August 15, 1985, p. 24.

70. *Al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443, August 15, 1985, p. 24.

71. Ibid., 24–25, and *al-Sayyad,* March 10–17, 1977, p. 55.

72. *Al-Sayyad* March 10–17, 1977, 56–57. See also *al-Anwar,* November 17, 1977; *al-Anwar,* September 26, 1977; *al-Anwar,* November 30, 1977, and December 1–4, 1977; *al-Amal,* December 25, 1977; *al-Wikala al-Wataniyya li al-Anba,* December 27, 1979; *al-Nahar,* April 14, 1979, and May 24, 1979; and *al-Sayyad,* March 10–17, 1977, p. 27.

73. Ibid.

74. See the meeting of Raymond Edde with Cardinal Etchegaray in the Vatican in *al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443. August 15, 1985, p. 27.

75. Raymond Edde in *al-Watan al-Arabi,* no. 443 (August 15, 1985), 28.

76. Jihad Salim, "Dawr al-Ruhban fi Balwarat al-Fikr al-Inʿizali," in *Nadwat al-Fikr al-Watani fi Muwajahat al-Mushkila al-Ta'ifiyya* (Beirut: Manshurat Majallat Fikr, 1981), 357–58.

77. See a summary of the pamphlet entitled *al-Mithaq al-Watani* in Jihad Salim, "Dawr al-Ruhban," 360–61.

78. See the memorandum submitted by the Maronite monks and the Maronite League to the Lebanese Parliament on November 3, 1975, and published by the Beirut newspaper *al-Anwar.*

79. See the lecture of Abbot Bulus Nuʿman entitled *al-Maruniyya wa Lebnan,* dated May 19, 1974 a summary of which is given by Jihad Salim, "Dawar al-Ruhban," 366–67.

80. For the ideas of Maronite writers who maintain that the Maronites are Arabs see Ghurayyib, *al-Ta'ifiyya,* and *al-Salibiyyun al-Lebnaniyyun* already cited.

81. See Bashir Jumayyil's speech at Dayr al-Salib on September 14, 1982, reproduced in *Lebanon News* 8, no. 18 (September 14, 1985), 1–2.

Bibliography

MANUSCRIPTS

Vatican Library

Vat. Syriac and Garshuni (Syriac written in Arabic letters) MS 146 contains the *Exposition of the Faith* ascribed to John Marun together with *The Ten Treatises* of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab.

Vat. Garshuni MS 210 contains the *Zajaliyya* of Jabra'il Ibn al-Qila'i.

Vat. Garshuni MS 395 contains *Apology for the Origin of the Maronites and Their Adherence to the Catholic Faith* by the Maronite Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi. This work was edited and published by Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni under the title *Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya (History of the Maronite Denomination)* (Beirut, 1890).

Vat. Garshuni MS 396 contains *Apology* for the *Maronite Denomination Against the Charges of Giovanni Battista Eliano and Thomas à Jesu the Carmelite.*

Vat. Garshuni MS 640 contains *Marun al-Tubani (Blessed Marun)* by the Maronite Bishop of Nicosia Jabra'il Ibn al-Qila'i. The author partly relates the life story of John Marun and defends the perpetual adherence of the Maronites to the Catholic faith.

Vat. Arabic MS 74 contains a collection of religious treatises relating to the faith of the Syrian Orthodox Church (Jacobite) compiled by the fifteenth-century Syrian writer Musa Ibn Atsha. In one of these treatises entitled *A Discourse on the Faith of the Syrian Church,* most likely written by Ibn Atsha, the author relates the episode of a certain monk named Marun who was dele-

gated by the Emperor Justinian I to the coastal towns of Lebanon and his possession by a demon. This is the *Discourse* which the Patriarch Istefan al-Duwayhi and other Maronite writers call "The Doctrine of the Jacobites." The MS also contains an Arabic translation of Bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Holy Eucharist,* made by Ibn Atsha.

Vat. Syriac MS 29 contains twenty-one liturgies including one ascribed to John Marun entitled, "A Liturgy of St. John, Patriarch of the Maronites known as Marun, the Saint and Doctor of the Church." Most of these liturgies, however, were drawn up by leading fathers of the Syrian Orthodox Church such as Liʿazar (Lazarus) Bar Sabto, bishop of Baghdad, Marutha, metropolitan of Tagrit, Tuma of Harclea, and others. This MS was transcribed by the priest Yamin son of Salim from the village of Haqil in 1846 of the Greeks (A.D. 1535).

Vat. Syriac MS 48 transcribed in Lebanon in A.D. 1507 contains ordinals for different church offices.

Vat. Syriac MS 101 contains a Syriac copy of Bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Holy Eucharist* together with Moses Bar Kifa's *On the Priesthood,* transcribed by Abraham Ecchellensis and ascribed to John Marun.

Vat. Garshuni MS 123 and 133 contain the *Book of al-Huda (Nomocanon).*

Vat. Syriac MS 405 contains a commentary on the Gospel by the eleventh-century Nestorian writer Abu al-Faraj Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib believed by Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud to have been distorted by Maronites. It was transcribed by Mikha'il from Lebanon in the year 7064 from the time of Adam, the year 1867 of the Greeks (A.D. 1555).

Bibliothèque Orientale de St. Joseph Université

Arabic MS 47 contains *al-Tarikh al-Wajiz (Compendium History)* by the Deacon Antonius Ibn al-Shaykh Abu Khattar al-Shidyaq of Ayn Turin, (Aynturini) Beirut, Lebanon. Pp. 53–61 of this MS includes *Mukhtasar Tarikh Jabraʾil al-Qilaʿi al-Lihfidi, (Compendious History of Jabraʾil al-Qilaʿi of Lihfid).*

Arabic MS 57 contains a prose version of the *Compendium History of al-Qilaʿi.*

Arabic MS 537 contains the acts of the Lebanese Council convoked by Joseph Assemani in the Monastery of Louisa, Lebanon, in 1736. Appended to this copy is the memorandum of Pope Benedict XIV confirming the acts of the council. This copy is not paginated.

Arabic MS 692 contains answers of the Malkite Patriarch Maximus Mazlum to questions addressed to him by a member of his congregation regarding the derivation of the term Maronite, the Monastery of Marun, and the faith of the Maronites.

Arabic MS 750 contains the letter of the Malkite Patriarch Cyril Tanas to Pope Benedict XIV, defending himself against the Maronites who accused him of desecrating the portrait of Saint Marun.

Arabic MS 785 contains Yuhanna Badhinjana's *Mir'at al-Haqq al-Wadiyya fi Sharaf al-Milla al-Maruniyya,* which is a defense of the perpetual adherence of the Maronites to the Catholic faith.

Arabic MS 16 contains a copy of Yuhanna Ujaymi's *al-Hujja al-Rahina fi Haqiqat Asl al-Mawarina,* being a treatise on the true origin of the Maronites addressed to the Khwaja Elias Abduh of Aleppo.

Syriac MS 31 contains a copy of Bar Salibi's *Commentary on the Holy Eucharist.*

Library of Dayr al-Kraym, Lebanon

Arabic MS 36 contains Bulus Masʿad's *al-Durr al-Manzum Radd ʿala al-Masa'il wa al-Ajwiba al-Mumdat bi Ism al-Batriyark Maximus Mazlum,* being a refutation of the answers of the Patriarch Maximus Mazlum to questions addressed to him by a member of his congregation regarding the term Maronite, the Monastery of Marun, and the faith of the Maronites.

Garshuni MS 31a contains *A Treatise on Faith* which is, in fact, the *Exposition of the Faith* attributed to John Marun.

Arabic MS 123 contains a list of Maronite patriarchs from 685 to 1672.

Library of the Monastery of Mar Dumit, Lebanon

Arabic MS 454 contains another copy of Antonius Aynturini's *Compendium History.* It also contains a Garshuni copy of *Madihat Kisrawan,* known as the *Zajaliyya,* by the Maronite Bishop Jabra'il Ibn al-Qilaʿi.

Bibliothèque de St. Paul Harisa, Lebanon

Arabic MS 106 contains the acts of the Lebanese Council (1736). Appended to these acts is a list of Maronite patriarchs from "Theopanes" to Yusuf Hubaysh (d. 1854). This copy is paginated.

Library of the Syrian Orthodox Church, Damascus, Syria

Garshuni MS 25 contains a *Discourse on the Faith of the Syrian Orthodox Church* referred to by Maronites as "The Doctrine of the Jacobites."

Garshuni MS 31 contains a summary of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Bar Hebraeus and its continuation to the nineteenth century. The compiler devoted several pages to the history of the Maronite Church derived mainly from Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis.*

Syriac MS containing a biography by Marqolon, a disciple of Saint Simon the Stylite. It consists of ninety-eight pages of medium size transcribed in the fourteenth century, quoted by Ignatius Yaʿqub III, *Nafh al-Abir,* p. 92, footnote 1.

British Museum Library

Syriac MS Add. 12, 155, fol. 163–164 contains a letter from the monks of the Monastery of Marun in Armanaz to a group of Syrian Orthodox monks in Antioch and the response of these monks to it.

Arabic MS Add. 19408 contains *al-Durr al-Multaqat min Kull Bahr wa Safat (Pearls Picked from Every Sea and Basket)* compiled by Muhammad Ibn Ali Ibn Mahmud al-Katib al-Dimashqi, completed in A.H. 743/1352 A.D..

Syriac MS Add. 12, 159 fols. 47a–51b contains Severus of Antioch, Homily (No. 30) on Saint Simon the Stylite.

Syriac MS Add. 17, 172 fol. 83 contains Saint Ephraim's metrical hymn on the Nativity of Our Lord.

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Arabic MS 203 contains a copy of the *Zajaliyya* of Ibn al-Qilaʿi together with the *Ten Treatises (al-Maqalat al-Ashr),* of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab. These *Treatises* were edited and published by Philip al-Samrani in *al-Manara* (1936).

WESTERN SOURCES

Abraham, Paul. *The Maronites of Lebanon: The Staunch Catholics of the Near East.* Wheeling, West Virginia: printed by the author, 1931.

Anaissi, Tobias. *Bullarium Maronitarum.* Rome: M. Bretschneider, 1911.

_____. *Collectio documentarum Maronitarum,* Liverno, 1921.

Assemani, Guiseppe Luigi (Yusuf Louis), ed. *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesia universae.* 13 vols. Rome, 1749–1766 (Reprinted, Paris-Leipzig: Huberti Welter, 1902).

Assemani, Stefano Evodius (Istefan Awwad), ed. *Acta Sanctorum martyrum orientalium et pocidentalium.* Rome: Typis Josephi Collini, 1748.

Assemani, Guiseppe Simone (Joseph Assemani). *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino Vaticana.* 4 vols. Rome: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de propaganda fide, 1719–1728.

_____. *Italicae Historiae Scriptores ex Bibliotheca Vaticana.* Rome: Typographia Komarek apud A. Ratilium, 1751–1753.

_____. *Bibliotheca juris orientalie canonici et civilis.* 5 vols. Rome: Typographia Komraek, 1762–1766.

Atiya, Azia. *History of Eastern Christianity.* South Bend, Indiana: Notre Dame University Press, 1967.

Attwater, Donald. *The Christian Churches of the East,* 2nd ed., 2 vols., Milwaukee, Wisconson: Bruce Publishing Co., 1947.

Badger, George Percy. *The Nestorians and Their Rituals.* 2 vols. London: Joseph Masters & Co., 1852.

Bardy, Gustave. *The Greek Literature of the Early Christian Church.* Translated into English by Mother Mary Reginald. London: Sands & Co., 1929.

Beggiani, Seely Joseph. *A Brief History and Commentary of The Divine Liturgy Of The Maronite Antiochene Church,* Diocese of St. Maron of Detroit, 1973.

_____. *Early Syriac Theology: With Special Reference to the Maronite Tradition.* University Press of America, 1983.

Beshara, Ronald. *A Church On The Move: Liturgical Reform in The Diocese of Saint Maron* (leaflet). n.p. and n.d.

Boyle, Isaac. *A Historical View of the Council of Nice with a Translation of Documents.* Philadelphia: Lippincot, 1879.

Butler, Howard Crosby. *Early Churches in Syria.* Edited and compiled by E. Baldwin Smith for the Department of Arts and Archaeology of Princeton University. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1929.

Carrington, Philip. *The Early Christian Church.* 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Chapman, John, Father. *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius.* London: Catholic Truth Society, 1907.

Charanis, Peter. *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire: The Religious Policy of Anastasius The First, 491–519.* Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1939.

Chesnut, Roberta. *Three Monophysite Christologies.* Oxford University Press, 1976.

Christology of the Later Fathers. Edited by Roachie, E. Hardy. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1954.

Churchill, Charles Henry Spencer. *The Druzes and the Maronites under Turkish Rule from 1840–60.* London, 1862. (Reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1973).

Combefis, François. *Historia haeresis monthelitarum.* Paris: Euriptibus Antonii Bertier, 1648.

Cureton, William. *Ancient Syriac Documents Relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity.* London: Williams & Norgate, 1864.

Cyril of Alexandria. *On the Incarnation Against Nestorius* (Oxford, 1881), with 105-page preface by E. B. Pusey.

Dahdah, Joseph al. *The Geography of Syria Followed by the History of the Original Maronite Church.* Sydney, Australia: R. T. Kelly Printers, 1899.

Dandini, Girolamo (Jerome). *Missione apostolica al patriarca e Maroniti del monte Libano.* Cesena, 1656. English translation, *A Voyage to Mount Lebanon wherein is an account of the customs, and manners & c., of the Turks. Also a description of Candia, Nicosia, Alexandretta & c.* Written originally in Italian, in John Pinkerton, editor. *A General Collection of the best and most interesting Voyages and Travels* 10. London, 1811.

Della Vida, Giorgio Levi. *Ricerche Sulla Formazione Del Piu Antico Fondo Monoscritti Oriental Della Bibliotheca Vaticana.* Vatican, 1939.

Denny, Edward. *Papalism: A Treatise on the Claims of the Papcy as Set Forth In The Encyclical Statis Cognitum.* London: Rivingtons, 1912.

Dib, Pierre. *L'Histoire de L'Église Maronite.* Beirut, 1962. An English translation of the same, *History of the Maronite Church.* Translated into English by Rev. Seely Beggiani. Detroit: Maronite Apostolic Exarchate, 1971.

_____. *Étude sur la liturgie Maronite.* Paris, 1919.

Dionysius the Areopagite. *The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite.* Translated into English by Rev. John Parker. New York: Richwood Publishing Co., 1976. (Reprinted from the original of 1897–1899).

Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Duschesne, Louis. *Early History of the Christian Church from its Foundation to the End of the Fifth Century* 4th ed. Translated into English by Claude Jenkins. 3 vols. London: John Murray, 1957.

Dvornik, Francis. *The Idea of Apostolicity and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew.* Harvard University Press, 1958.

Epistolae Imperatorum Pontificum Aliorum Avellana Quae Dicitur Collectio. Edited by Otto Geunther. *CSEL* 35. Vienna, 1898.

Evagrius Scholasticus. *Ecclesiastical History.* London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854. This work is translated from the Greek into English and published together with the *Ecclesiastical History* of Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, under the title *History of the Church* but without identifying the translator.

Festugière, A. J. *Antioche Païnne Et Chrétienne.* Paris: Edition E. de Boccard, 1959.

Fortescue, Adrian. *The Lesser Eastern Churches.* London: Catholic Truth Society, 1913.

Frend, W. H. C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement: Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries,* Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Ghaziri, Bernard Ghobaira al. *Rome Et L'Église Syrienne—Maronite D' Antioche (517–1531).* B. P. Maisonneveue, Editeur. Paris: Libraire Orientale Et American, 1906.

Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* 5 vols. Edited by Rev. H. H. Hilman, Philadelphia: Coates, 1860, and the same ed., vol 8. J. B. Bury. New York: Fred De Fau and Company, 1907.

Gill, J. *The Council of Florence.* Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Graf, Georg. *Geschichte der Christlichen Arabischen Literatur.* 5 vols. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1947.

Green, John. *A Journey from Aleppo to Damascus with a Description of Those two Capital Cities and Neighbouring Parts of Syria,* etc. London: printed for W. Mears, 1735–1736.

Harik, Iliya. *Politics and Change in a Traditional Society: Lebanon 1711–1845.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1968.

Harnack, Adolph. *History of Dogma.* 7 vols. Translated into English by Neil Buchanan. Dover, New York: n.d.

Hefele, Charles Joseph. *A History of the Christian Councils.* 5 vols. Translated into English by William R. Clark. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1871–1896.

Hitti, Philip K. *History of Syria Including Lebanon and Palestine.* New York: MacMillan, 1951.

_____. *Lebanon in History.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1957.

Hoeck, Johannes M. *Decree on Eastern Catholic Churches.* Translated into English by Lalit Adolphus, in *Commentary On The Documents of Vatican* 2, no. 1. New York: Herder & Herder, 1967.

Honigmann, Ernest. *Évéques Et Évéchés Monophysites D'Asie Anterieure Au VI Siècle.* Louvain: Impremerie Orinetaliste, Louvain, 1951.

Hurewitz, J. C. *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East.* 2 vols. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nastrand, 1956.

Jacques De Vitry. *Histoire Hierosolomitana, in Bongars, Gesta Dei per Frances Orientalis Historiae* 1. Hanover, 1611. An English translation of this work, *The History of Jerusalem,* by Aubery Stewart is in *Palestine Pilgrim's Text Society* 11. London, 1896.

John of Damascus. *De Recta Sententia.* Edited by Michel (Michael) Lequien, in Migne. *Patrologia Graeca* 94, 1421–432.

_____. *Epistola Ad Jordanem Archimandritam De Hymno Trisagio.* Edited by Michel (Michael) Lequien, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca,* 95, 22–62.

Jouplain (Bulus Nujaym). *La question du Liban.* 2nd. ed. Jonieh, 196.

Jugie, Martin. *Les schisme byzantin, aperçue historique et doctrinal.* Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1941.

Kidd, B. J. *A History of the Church to A.D. 461.* 3 vols. Oxford University Press, 1922.

_____. *The Churches of Eastern Christendom.* London: Faith Press, 1927.

Labourt, Jerome. *Le Christianisme dans l' Empire Perse sous la dynastie Sassanide* (224–632). Paris: V. Lecoffre, 1904.

Labourt, M. *Antiqua ecclesia Syro-Chaldiacae tradition circa petri apostoli e jusque successorum romanorum pontificum divinium primatur.* Rome, 1879.

Lebon, Joseph. *Le Monophysisme Sévérien Étude Historique, Littéraire Et Théologique Sur la résistance monophysite au Concile de Chalcédoine.* Louvain, 1909. (Reprinted AMS Press, 1979–80).

Lequien, Michel. *Oriens Christianus.* 3 vols. Paris: Typographia regis, 1740.

Lietzmann, Hans. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule.* Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1904.

Ligouri, Alfonso Maria de. *The History of Heresies and Their Refutation.* 2 vols. Translated into English by Rev. John T. Mullock. Dublin: J. Duffy, 1847.

Loofs, Friedrick. *Nestorius and His Place in The History of Christian Doctrine.* Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Mackintosh, H. R. *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931.

Magoulias, Harry J. *Byzantine Christianity: Empire, Church and the West.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970.

Mann, Horace Kinder. *The Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages.* 18 vols. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubnere Co.; St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1925–1932.

Martyrologii Romani Gregorii XIII, Jussu editi Urban VIII et Celmentis X etc. Rome: J. Salviucci and Son, 1845.

Methodius, G. Fouyas (Archbishop). *The Person of Jesus Christ In The Decisions of the Ecumenical Councils.* Addis Ababa: Central Printing Press, 1976, 174–184.

Mosheim, J. L. Von. *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern.* 3 vols. Translated into English by James Murdock. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1844.

Naaman, Paul P. *Théodoret de Cyr et al Monastère de Saint Maroun: Les Origines des Maronites.* Lebanon: Universite Saint-Esprit Kaslik, 1971.

Nairon, (Naironus) Antonius Faustus. *Dissertatio de origine, nomine ac religione Maronitarum.* Rome: Zacharian Dominicum Acamitek a Kronenfeld, 1679.

_____. *Evoplia fidei Catholicae romanae historieo-dogmatica ex vetustissimis syrorum, seu chaldaeorum monumentis eruts,* etc. Rome: Typis S. cong. de Propaganda fide, 1694.

Nau, François. *Opuscules Maronites.* Paris: Chez Ernest Lerous, 1899–1900.

Neale, John M. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church.* 2 vols. London: Masters, 1850.

Nöldeke, Theodor. *Sketches from Eastern History.* Translated into English by John Sutherland Black. Beirut: Khayat, 1963.

The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith, etc. Edited by T. H. Bindley and F. W. Green, 4th ed. London: Methner, 1950.

Parsons, Rueben. *Studies in Church History.* 3rd ed. 6 vols. Philadelphia: J. J. McVey, 1886–1900.

Photius of Constantinople. Bibliotheca, in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 103.

Quaresmio, Francisco. *Historia, Theologia Moralis Terrae Sanctae Elucidatio,* etc. 1st ed. Antwerp, 1634–1639. 2nd ed. Venice: Typis Antonellianis, 1880–1881.

Rabbath, Anton. *Documents inédits pour Servir a l' histoire du Christianisme en Orient.* 2 vols. Paris-Leipzig: A. Picard, 1905–1910.

Raphael, Pierre. *The Role of the Maronites in the Return of the Oriental Churches.* Translated into English by Rev. Peter A. Eid. Youngstown, Ohio: United Printing Co., 1945.

Raven, Charles Earle. *Apollinarianism; an essay on the Christology of the early Church.* Cambridge University Press, 1923.

Relazione dell' ablegaziene apostolica alla razione de Maronitinella Siria e Monte Libano (in 1736) de Monsignor Guiseppe Assemani alla S. Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. Rome, 1741. Parts 3 and 13.

Renaudot, Eusèbe. *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio.* 2 vols. 2nd ed. Francofurti Ad Moenum, Eumptibus Josephi Baer Bibliopolae, Londine, Apud Joanneum Leslie Bibliopolam, 1847. (Reprinted with an introduction by Rev. J. M. Hussey, Franborough: Greg, 1970).

Renouf, Sir Peter. *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius.* London: Longmans Green, 1868.

_____. *The Case of Honorius Reconsidered.* London: Longmans Green Readere Dyer, 1869.

Roux-Charles F. *France et Chretiens d' Orient.* Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1939.

Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et Amplissima Collectio. Edited by Giovanni D. Mansi. Florence and Venice, 1759–1798.

Sacrosancta Concilia. 17 vols. Edited by Philip Labbe and Gabriel Cossartii. Paris: Societatis Typographicae Librorum Ecclesiasticorum Jussu Regis Constitutatae, 1671–1672.

Salibi, Kamal S. *Maronite Historians of Medieval Lebanon.* Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1959.

_____. *The Modern History of Lebanon.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965.

Sarkissian, Karekin. *The Council of Chalcedon and the Armenian Church.* 2nd. ed. New York: Armenian Church Prelacy, 1975.

Sellers, R. V. *The Council of Chalcedon.* London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Suriano, Francesco. *Il trattato di Terra Santa e dell' Orient.* Edited by Girolamo Golubovich. Milan, 1900. For translation of this work see *Treatise of the Holy Land,* translated into English by Theophilus Bellorini and Eugene Hoade. Jerusalem: printed at the Franciscan Press, 1949.

Synodus provincialis a Remo Domino Patriarcha Antiocheno, archiepiscopis et episcopis nec non clere saeculari et regulari nationis syrorum maronitarum una cum Remo D. Jos. Sim. Assemano, Sedia apostolicae Ablegate, in Monte Libano celebrata Anno 1736, Rome, 1820. This work contains the Latin version of the Lebanese Council of 1736. For the Arabic version of the same look under manuscripts.

Tchalenko, G. *Villages antique de la Syrie du Nord.* 3 vols. Paris: P. Geuthner 1953–1958.

The Maronite Rite: A Catechism. Edited by Msgr. Abi Nader. Maronite Apostolic Exarchate, 1972.

Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus. *Religiosa Historia in Patrologia Graeca* 82. Edited by J. P. Migne. Paris: Migne Printers, 1855.

_____. *Ecclesiastical History.* London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.

Theophanes. *Chronographia* in *Patrologia Graeca* 108. Edited by J. P. Migne. Paris, 1863.

Thomas à Jesu. *De Procuranda Salute Omnium Gentium.* Rome, 1613. (Reprinted by Collegio Internationale S. Teresa, Rome, 1940.)

Vasiliev, A. A. *Justin the First: An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great.* Harvard University Press, 1950.

_____. *The Byzantine Empire.* 2 vols. University of Wisconsin, 1964.

Villien, Antoine. *L' abbé Eusèbe Renaudot, essay sur sa vie et Sur son oeuvre liturgique.* Paris: V. Le Coffre, 1904.

Vööbus, Arthur. *A History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient.* 2 vols. Louvain, 1958–1960.

Wigram, W. A. *The Separation of the Monophysites.* London: Faith Press, LTD., 1923.

William of Tyre. *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum,* in *Patrologia Latina* 201. For English translation see *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Seas.* 2 vols. Translated into English by A. Babcock and A. C. Krey. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.

Wright, William. *A Short History of Syriac Literature.* London: Adam & Charles Black, 1894.

_____. *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum.* 3 vols. London, 1870–1872.

EASTERN SOURCES

Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum. Edited by Paul Bedjan. Leipzig, 1894.

Anaissi, Tubiyya al-. *Silsila Tarikhiyya li Batarikat al-Mawarina.* Rome, 1927.

Baladhuri, Ahmad al-. *Futuh al-Buldan.* 3 vols. Edited by Salah al-Din al-Munajjid. Cairo, 1956.

Bar Hebraeus, Gregorius. *Chronicon Ecclelesiasticum.* 3 vols. Edited with Latin translation by J. B. Abbeloos and Thomas J. Lamy. Louvain, 1872–1877.

Bar Salibi, Dionysius Jacob. *A Treatise of Barsalibi Against the Melchites.* Translated into English by Alphonse Mingana. Woodbrooks Studies, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 11 (1927), 110–203.

_____. *Expositio liturgiae.* Edited and translated into Latin by Hieroniymous (Jerome) Labourt. Paris, 1903. In *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 5, 13–14. Scriptores Syriac, Ser. 2, t. 98. (Reprinted, Louvain, 1955).

Barsoum, Ignatius Afram (Patriarch of Antioch). *Kitab al-Lu'lu al-Manthur fi Tarikh al-Ulum wa al-Adab al-Suryaniyya.* 2nd ed. Aleppo. 1956. (Reprinted by the Syriac Academy, Bagdad, 1976). First ed. Hims, Syria, 1943.

Batriq, Sa'id Ibn (Eutychius). *Kitab al-Tarikh al-Majmu' 'ala al-Tahqiq wa al-Tasdiq.* Edited by L. Cheikho. Beirut, 1905 and 1909. In *Corpus Scriptorum Christianarum Orientalium,* Scriptores Arabici Textus Series Tertia-Tomus VI and VII. Latin Translation in Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 111.

Behnam, Bulus. *Khama'il al-Rihan aw Orthodoxiyyat Mar Ya'qub al-Sarugi al-Malfan.* Mosul, n.d.

Bustani, Fu'ad Afram al-. *Mar Marun.* Beirut, 1965.

Chabot, J. B. *Les Origines des la legénde de Saint Jean Maron, Academie des Inscription et belle-lettres* 43, no. 2. *Memoirs.* Paris, 1951.

_____. *La liturgie Attribuée À Saint Jean Maron.* Paris: Imprimiere Nationale, 1940.

_____. *Le Légende de St. Bassus et son Couvent À Apamée.* Paris, 1893.

Chebli, Butrus. *Tarjamat Abina al-Maghbut Istefan al-Duwayhi Batriyark Antakiya.* Beirut, 1913.

Cher, Addai. *Tarikh Kaldo wa Athur.* 2 vols. Beirut, 1912–1913.

Chronica Minora 1. Edited by I. Guidi. *CSCO,* 1960; Vol. 11, edited by E. W. Brooks. *CSCO,* 1960; Vol. 111, edited by E. W. Brooks, I. Guidi, and J. B. Chabot. *CSCO,* 1961; and the Arabic translation of *Chronica Minora* entitled *al-Tarikh al-Saghir.* Made by Rev. Butrus Haddad. Baghdad, 1976.

Chronicon ad annum Domini 819 Pertinens, anon. Edited and translated into French by J. B. Chabot, *CSCO,* Scriptores Syri III, 14. Louvain, 1937.

Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 Pertinens, anon. Edited and translated by E. W. Brooks and J. B. Chabot, *CSCO,* Scriptores Syri III, 4. Paris, 1903.

Daghir, Yusuf. *Batarikat al-Mawarina.* Beirut, 1959.

Dawud, Clement Yusuf. *Kitab Jami' al-Hujaj al-Rahina fi Ibtal Da'awa al-Mawarina.* Cairo-Leipzig, 1908.

Daww, Butrus. *Tarikh al-Mawarina al-Dini wa al-Siyasi wa al-Hadari* 1. Beirut, 1970.

Deryan, Yusuf. *Lubab al-Barahin al-Jaliyya 'an Haqiqat Amr al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya.* n.p., 1911.

_____. *Al-Barahin al-Rahina fi al-Marada wa al-Jarajima wa al-Mawarina.* Beirut, 1904.

Dibs, Yusuf al-. *Ruh al-Rudud fi Tafnid Za'm al-Khuri Yusuf Dawud.* Beirut: al-Umumiyya Press, 1871.

_____. *Al-Jami' al-Mufassal fi Tarikh al-Mawarina al-Mu'assal.* Beirut: Catholic Press, 1905.

_____. *Tarikh Suriyya.* 8 vols. Beirut, 1899–1905.

Documents Ad Origines Monophysitarum Illustranda. Edited by J. B. Chabot, in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 37. Paris: E Typographeo Republicae, Lipsiae, Otto Harrassowitz, 1917.

Duwayhi, Istefan al-. *Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya.* Edited by Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni. Beirut, 1890.

_____. *Tarikh al-Azmina.* Edited by Ferdinand Taoutel al-Yasuʿi. Catholic Press, Beirut: 1951.

_____. *Manarat al-Aqdas.* 2 vols. Edited by al-Shartuni. Beirut, 1895–1896.

Fahd, Butrus, ed. *Kitab al-Huda wa Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya.* Jonieh, Lebanon, 1954.

Fida, Abu al. *Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar.* Edited by H. O. Fleischer. Leipzig, 1831.

Hamawi, Yaqut al-. *Muʿjam al-Buldan.* Beirut, 1956.

Haqq, Ibn Abd al-. *Marasid al-Ittilaʿ fi Asma al-Amkina wa al-Biqaʿ.* Leiden, 1852.

Hobeika, Joseph. *Explaction de la Litrugie Syriaque per Saint Jean Maron: 627–707.* Beirut, 1922.

Iacobi Sarugensis Epistolae Quotquot Supersent. Edited by Gunnar Olinder. Louvain, 1952. In *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* 116.

Ibri, ibn al- (Bar Hebraeus). *Tarikh Mukhtasar al-Duwal.* 2nd ed. Anton Salhani. Beirut, 1958.

Ignatius Yaʿqub III (Patriarch of Antioch). *Nafh al-Abir aw Sirat al-Batriyark Mar Severus al-Kabir.* Damascus, 1970.

_____. *Al-Haqa'iq al-Jaliyya fi al-Abhath al-Tarikhiyya wa al-Adabiyya wa al-Falsafiyya.* Damascus, 1972.

_____. *Hibat al-Iman aw al-Malfan Mar Yaʿqub al-Sarugi Isquf Batnan.* Damascus, 1971.

John Bishop of Asia (Ephesus). *Lives of the Eastern Saints.* Translated into English by E. W. Brooks. Paris, 1923–1926.

_____. *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John Bishop of Ephesus.* Translated into English by R. Payne Smith. Oxford University Press, 1890.

John Bishop of Nikiu. *The Chronicle of John Bishop of Nikiu.* Translated into English by R. H. Charles. London: Williams & Norgate, 1916.

Joshua the Stylite. *The Chronicle of Joshua The Stylite.* Translated into English by William Wright. Cambridge University Press, 1882.

Kitab al-Muhamat ʿan al-Mawarina wa Qiddishim. Compiled by Rev. Afram al-Dirani and revised by Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni. n.p., 1899. It contains the following treatises:

1. *Risala li al-Tayyib al-Dhikr al-Khuri Anton al-Qayyala al-Beiruti Tilmidh Roma,* pp. 1–101.
2. *Al-Kitab al-Jadali.* Istefan Awwad Assemani. pp. 103–457. This same treatise pp. 223–457 contains a defense of the Maronites and their saints sent by the Patriarch Yusuf Istefan to the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide submitted by Istefan Awwad Assemani.
3. *Al-Ajwiba al-Saniyya ʿan al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya.* Reverend Mikha'il Fadil and Rev. Elias al-Jumayyil. pp. 458–92.
4. *Al-Malikiyya wa al-Maruniyya.* Bulus Masʿad. pp. 493–513.

Lammens, Henri. *Tasrih al-Absar fi ma Yahtawi Lebnan min al-Athar.* 2 vols. Beirut, 1913–1914.

Mas'ad, Bulus. *Al-Durr al-Manzum.* Tamish, Lebanon, 1863.

Mas'udi, Abu al-Hasan. *Kitab al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf.* Edited by Abd Allah Isma'il al-Sawi. Cairo, 1938.

_____. *Muruj al-Dhahab wa Ma'adin al-Jawhar.* 4 vols. Edited by Muhammad Muhyi al-Din Abd al-Hamid. Cairo, 1938.

Matta, Amr Ibn. *Akhbar Fatarikat al-Mashriq min Kitab al-Majdal.* Edited by Henricus Gesmondi. Rome, 1896.

Mikha'il Rabo (Michael the Great or the Syrian). *Kthobo d Makhthabanuth Zabne (Chronicle).* Edited by J. B. Chabot. Paris, 1899–1910. A French translation of this work is made by J. B. Chabot entitled *Chronique De Michel Le Syrien.* 3 vols. Paris, 1899–1905. Vols. 2, 357–529, and 3, 1–11 contain the history of Dionysius Tal Mahri.

Missale Chaldiacum Iuxta ritum Ecclessia nationis Maronitarum. Rome, 1594.

Muqaffa', Severus Ibn al-. *Kitab al-Majami'.* Edited by P. Chelbi with the title *Refutation de Sa'id Ibn-Batriq (Eutychius) (Le Livre des Counciles)* in *Patrologia Orientalis* 3 (1905), 121–242.

_____. *Kitab al-Majami'.* Edited by L. Leroy. Book 2 in *Patrologia Orientalis* 2 (1911), 456–600.

Muzhir, Yusuf. *Tarikh Lebnan al-Am.* 2 vols. n.d. and n.p.

Naqqash, Zaki al-. *Adwa Tawdihiyya 'ala Tarikh al-Maruniyya.* Beirut: Dar Lebnan li al-Tiba'a wa al-Nashr, 1970.

Nasri, Butrus. *Dhakhirat al-Adhhan fi Tarikh al-Mashariqa wa al-Maghariba al-Suryan.* 2 vols. Beirut. 1912–1913.

Nestorius. *La Livre d' Héraclides de Damas* (Syriac version). Edited by Paul Bedjan. Paris-Leipzig, 1900. English translation of the same, *The Bazaar of Heraclides,* is by G. R. Driver and L. Hodgson. Oxford, 1925. French translation, François Nau, *Le Livre d' Heraclide.* Paris, 1910.

Philoxenus Bishop of Mabug. *Three Letters of Philoxenus Bishop of Mabough 485–519.* Edited and translated into English by Arthur Adolphe Vaschalde. Rome: Tipografia Della R. Academia Dei Lincei, 1902.

Qara'ali, Bulus. *Hurub al-Muqaddamin 1075–1450.* Beirut, 1937.

Qazan, Fu'ad. *Lebnan fi Muhitihi al-Arabi.* Beirut, Dar al-Farabi, 1972.

Qila'i, Jabra'il Ibn al-. *Madihat Kisrawan* (Zajaliyya), *Al-Majalla al-Suriyya al-Batriyarkiyya* 5 (1930), 513–530, 602–618; Vol. 6 (1931), 33–40, 160–68, 464–72, 529–36, 617–24, 637–78; and Vol. 7 (1932), 321–28, 401–508; al-Duwayhi, *Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya.* Edited by Rashid al-Khuri al-Shartuni. Beirut, 1890. pp. 62–63, 82, 90; Philip Tarrazi, *Asdaq ma kan 'an Tarikh Lebnan wa Safha min Akhbar al-Suryan* 1. Beirut, 1947. pp. 83–90. An English translation of the same is in Kamal S. Salibi, *Maronite Historians of Medieval Lebanon.* Beirut, 1959. pp. 34–36, 42, 45, 52–54, 61–62, 64–65, 70–71, 73, 77, 84.

Rahmani, Ignatius. *Al-Mabahith al-Jaliyya fi al-Liturgiyyat al-Sharqiyya wa al-Gharbiyya.* Al-Sharfa Monastery, 1924.

Rustam, Asad. *Al-Rum fi Siyasatihim wa Hadaratihim wa Dinihim wa Thaqafatihim wa Silatihim bi al-Arab.* 2 vols. Beirut, 1955.

_____. *Kanisat Madinat Allah Antakiya al-Uzma.* 3 vols. Beirut, 1958.

Severus of Antioch. *Le Philalèthe* (Syriac text with French translation). Edited by Robert Hespel. Louvain, 1952.

Severus of Antioch. *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch, in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis.* 2 vols. Edited and translated into English by E. W. Brooks. London, 1903–1904.

_____ (Sozopolitaneos). *A Collection of Letters from Numerous Syriac Manuscripts.* Edited and translated into English by E. W. Brooks, Paris, 1915–1920.

Shababi, Mikha'il Abd Allah Gabriel. *Tarikh al-Kanisa al-Antakiyya al-Suryaniyya al-Maruniyya.* 3 vols. Beirut, 1900–1906.

Shahin, Gregorius Jirjis. *Nahj Wasim fi Tarikh al-Umma al-Suryaniyya al-Qawim.* 2 vols. Syria: Sabra Press, 1911.

_____. *Kashf al-Anqiba ʿan Wujuh al-Mu'allifin wa al-Mu'arrikhin al-Kadhaba.* n.p.: 1911.

Shidyaq, Tannus al. *Akhbar al-Aʿyan fi Jabal Lebnan.* Revised by Butrus al-Bustani. Beirut, 1859.

Sulayman, Mari Ibn. *Akhbar Fatarikat Kursi al-Mashriq min Kitab al-Majdal.* Edited by Henricus Gismondi. Rome, 1899.

Tarrazi, Viscount Philip. *Asdaq ma Kan ʿan Tarikh Lebnan wa Safha min Akhbar al-Suryan.* 3 vols. Beirut, 1948–1949.

The Divine Liturgy of St. James. English translation published by Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, New York, 1967.

The Life of St. Simeon the Stylite: A Translation of the Syriac Text in Paul Bedjan's, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum.* Translated into English by Frederick Lent. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 35 (1915–1917), 103–198.

The Second Synod of Ephesus. Edited and translated into English by Samuel G. F. Perry. Dartford, kent, 1881.

Tuma, Severus Yaʿqub. *Tarikh al-Kanisa al-Suryaniyya al-Antakiyya.* 2 vols. Beirut, 1963.

Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy. Translated into English by R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington. London: Williams & Norgate, 1913.

Yasuʿi, Ferdinand Toautel al-. *Watha'iq Tarikhiyya ʿan Halab: Akhbar al-Mawarina wa ma Ilayhim min 1606 ila yawmina.* Beirut: Catholic Press, 1960.

Zachariah of Mitylene. *The Syriac Chronicle Known as that of Zachariah of Mitylene.* Translated into English by F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks. London: Methuen & Co., 1899.

ARTICLES

Ajam, E. "Le Monothelisme Des Maronites D'Apres Auteurs Malchites," *Échos D' Orient* 9 (Paris, 1906), 91–95.

Anawati, G. C. "The Roman Catholic Church and Churches in Communion with Rome," in *Religion in the Middle East.* Edited by A. J. Arberrt, 1 (1969), 347–422.

Antoni, A. Daww. "Tarikh al-Patriyarkiyya al-Antakiyya al-Maruniyya," *al-Mashriq* 61 (1967), 391–456.

Armala, Ishaq. "Al-Malikiyyun, Batriarkiyyatuhum al-Antakiyya wa Lughatuhum al-Wataniyya wa al-Taqsiyya" (The Malkites: Their Antiochian Patriarchate, and National and Ritualistic Language), *al-Mashriq* 34 (1936), 37–66, 211–34, 362–94.

_____. "Al-Rutab al-Kahnutiyya li al-Ta'ifatayn al-Maruniyya wa al-Suryaniyya" (Ecclesiastical Offices of both the Maronite and the Syrian Churches), *al-Mashriq* 30 (1932), 161–69, 297–302, 365–71, 531–37, 848–55, 933–39.

Baysari, Francis Rev. al. "Muqabala bayn al-Imadh al-Yaᶜqubi al-Qadim wa al-Imadh al-Maruni al-Hadith," *al-Mashriq* 62 (1968), 139–54.

Brehier, Louis. "Attempts at Reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches," *The Cambridge Medieval History,* planned by J. B. Bury, 4, Chapter XIX (New York), 619–26.

Canard, M. "Djaradjima," *The Encyclopedia of Islam* 11 (1965), 456–58.

Cheikho, Louis. "Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ al-Khalqayduni fi al-Tarikh" (The Martyrs of the Council of Chalcedon in History), *al-Mashriq* 22 (1924), 599–603.

_____. "Al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya wa al-Ruhbaniyya al-Yasuᶜiyya fi al-Qarnayn al-Sadis Ashar wa al-Sabiᶜ Ashar" (The Maronite Denomination and the Jesuit Order in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries), *al-Mashriq* 18 (1920), 65–69, 300–309, 675–86, 969–76, and *al-Mashriq* 9 (1921), 138–46, 293–302, 625–30, 758–70.

Crawford, Robert W. "William of Tyre and the Maronites," *Speculum* (April, 1955), 222–28.

Dibs, Yusuf al. "Al-Marada wa al-Mawarina" (The Marada or Mardaites and the Maronites), *al-Mashriq* 5 (1902), 914–23.

_____. "Laysa al-Jarajima al-Marada" (The Jarajima are not the Marada or Mardaites), *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903), 403–418.

Duwayhi, Istefan al. "Slisilat Batarikat al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya" (List of the Patriarchs of the Maronites Denomination), in *al-Mashriq,* edited by Rashid al-Shartuni, 1 (1898), 247–52, 308–313, 347–53, 390–96.

Frankel, Ephraim A. "The Maronite Patriarch: An Historical View of a Religious Zaᶜim in the 1958 Lebanese Crisis," *The Muslim World,* LXVI, No. 3 (October, 1976), 213–225 and in NO. 4, 245–258.

Frend, W. H. C. "Christianity in the Middle East: Survey Down to A.D. 1800," in *Religion In The Middle East,* edited by A. J. Arberry, 2 vols. Cambridge,

1969, 239–96.

Ghalib, Butrus (Chorepiscopus). "Nawabigh al-Madrasa al-Maruniyya al-Ula" (The First Prominent Graduates of the Maronite School), *al-Mashriq* 22 (1924), 17–30, 100–114, 341–50, 438–48, 497–508, 586–98, 708–719. In this article the author discusses the activities and achievements of prominent graduates of the Maronite School in Rome such as the Patriarchs Istefan al-Duwayhi and Jirjis Amira. He also discusses the mission of Jerome Dandini to the Maronites.

Gribomont, Jean. "Documents Sur Les Origines De L'Église Maronite," *Parole de l'Orient* 5 (Kaslik, Lebanon, 1974), 95–132.

John of Asia (Ephesus). "Lives of the Eastern Saints: Spurious Life of James," edited into English by E. B. Brooks, *Patrologia Orientalis,* edited by R. Graffin and F. Nau, 19 (Paris, 1925), 229–73.

Karmali, Anastase Marie al-. "Al-Marada aw al-Jarajima" (The Marada or the Jarajima), *al-Mashriq* 6 (1903), 301–309.

Krüger, G. "Monothelitism," *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* edited by James Hastings, 8 (1916), 921–25.

Labourt, J. "Maronites," *The Catholic Encyclopedia,* edited by Charles G. Herbermann, 9 (1913), 683–88.

Lammens, Henri. "Al-Akh (Fra) Gryphon wa Jabal Lebnan fi al-Qarn al-Khamis Ashar" (Friar Gryphon and the Mount of Lebanon in the Fifteenth Century), *al-Mashriq* 1 (1898), 11–17, 56–62, 123–28, 145–50.

_____. "Frère Gryphon et le Liban su XV ème Siècle," *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* 4 (1899), 68–104.

_____. "Al-Marada" (The Mardaites, *al-Mashriq,* V (1902), 914–923.

_____. "Al-Rum al-Malikiyyun: Nubdha fi Aslihim wa Jinsiyyatihim" (The Malkite Rum 'Byzantines' A Tract on Their Origin and Nationality), *al-Mashriq* 111 (1900), 267–73.

Malik, Charles H. "The Orthodox Church," in *Religion In the Middle East,* edited by A. J. Arberry, 2 Vols. Cambridge, 1969, 297–346.

Mingana, A. "Syriac Influence On the Style of the Kur'an," *John Rylands Library Bulletin* 11 (London, 1927), 77–98.

Moosa, Matti. "The Relation of the Maronites of Lebanon to the Mardaites and al-Jarajima," *Speculum* 44 (1969), 597–608.

_____. "Origins of the Christian Minorities in the Middle East," *Bibliophilos* 1 no. 2 (Union City, Pennsylvania, Spring, 1982), 83–97.

Nau, François. "Lettre De Jacques D' Édesse Au Diacre George sur une Hymne Composee par S. Ephrem Et Citee par S. Jean Maron," *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* 6 (1901), 115–31.

_____. "Maronites, Mazonites Et Maranites," *Revue de l' Orient Chrétien* 9 (1904), 268–70.

Nöldeke, Theodor. *"Die Namen der aramaischen Nation and Sprache," Zeitschrift der Deutscher Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* 25 (1871), 113–31.

_____. "Zur Geschichte der Araber im l. Jahrh d. H. Aus syrischen Quellen," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenladischen Gesellschaft* 29 (1875), 76–98.

Nuzha, Farid. "Asl Mawarinat Lebnan," *al-Jamiʿa al-Suryaniyya* 14 (Buenos Aires, 1948), 130–35.

Prentice, W. K. "Fragments of an Early Christian Liturgy in Syrian Inscription," *Transactions of American Philological Association* 33 (1902), 81–87.

Ploeg, J. Ven Der. "Isaac Armala, Mar Yaʿcub Usquf Sarug al-Malfan, bahth intiqadi, tarikhi, dini," Jounnie, Lebanon, 1946, in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 5, no. 5 (September 1948), 153–56, Book Review.

Rajji, Mikha'il al-. "Fi al-Taqs al-Maruni" (On Maronite Rite), *al-Mashriq* 33 (1902), 81–87.

_____. "Bayan ʿan Kitab al-Kahnut," *al-Mashriq* 47 (1953), 635–45.

_____. "Nass Qadim bi al-Arabiyya li Majmaʿay Qanubin Sanat 1596," *al-Mashriq* 46 (1952), 419–24.

Salibi, Kamal S. "Al-Mawarina," *al-Nahar* Dossier, no. 40 (Beirut, January 5, 1971), 3–50.

_____. "The Maronite Church in the Middle Ages and its Union with Rome," *Oriens Christianus* 42 (1958), 92–104.

_____. "The Muqaddams of Bsharri 1382–1621," *Arabica* 15 (1958), 63–86.

_____. "The Maronites of Lebanon under Frankish and Mamluk Rule," *Arabica* 4 (1957), 290–96.

_____. "Northern Lebanon Under the Dominance of Ghazir, 1517–1591," *Arabica* 14 (1967), 144–66.

Samuel, V. C. "One Incarnate Nature of God the Word," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 10 no. 2 (Winter, 1964–1965), 37–53.

Stamouli, A. A. "Maronites," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, 7 (1910), 188–90.

Torrey, Charles C. "The Letters of Simeon the Stylite," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 20 (1899), 258–70.

Vailhé, Siméon. "L' Église Maronite Du V Au IV Siecle," *Echos d' Orient* 9 (Paris, 1906), 344–51.

_____. "Origines religiouses des Maronites," *Echos d' Orient* 4 (1901), 96–102, 154–62, and *Echos d' Orient* (1902), 281–89.

_____. "Fra Suriano et la perpetuel orthodoxie Des Maronites," *Echos d' Orient* 7 (1904), 99–102.

_____. "Melchites et Maronites," *Echos d' Orient* 6 (1903), 143–47.

Index

Abd Allah Ibn al-Tayyib (d. 1043), Nestorian writer, 122, 198–99, 201, 254
Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwan, Umayyad Caliph, 115, 142–43, 181–82, 186–87, 193
Abdisho, Nestorian writer (d. 1318), 121, 128, 212
Abraham al-Haqillani (Ecchellensis), 7, 122, 128, 148, 151–56, 160–61, 165
Abraham, Paul, Maronite priest, defends Pope Honorius, 207
Abu Isa Ahmad Ibn Ali al-Munajjim, 28
Achigarai, Cardinal, 302
Addai Cher, Chaldean bishop, 70
Adeodat, Pope (672–676), 127
Afif, Shaykh Yazbak Ibn Abd al-, 281
Agapetus, Pope (535–536), 39, 52–54, 78–79
Agapetus, disciple of the fifth-century Marun, 26
Agathon, father of John Marun according to al-Duwayhi, 6, 120, 122
Ahmad, Amir (d. 1679), 283
Aimerick, Latin patriarch, 219, 225
Akari, Musa al- (d. 1567), Maronite patriarch, 280
Al-Jamiʿ al-Mufassal fi Tarikh al-Mawarina al-Muʾassal, 9, 18, 84
ʿAlmana (Secularization) proposed by Patriarch Khreish, 301
Al-Marada wa al-Jarajima by al-Karmali, 185
Al-Marada wa al-Mawarina by Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, 188
Al-Mukhtasar fi Akhbar al-Bashar by Abu al-Fida, 28
Alp Arslan, Saljuk Sultan, 218
Alexander IV, Pope, 138, 229, 266
Alexandria Protocol, 291
Amanus. *See* Lukam al-
Amira, Jirjis (d. 1644), Maronite Patriarch, 268, 281–82
Amshiti, Irmia (Jeremiah) (d. 1230), Maronite Patriarch, 123, 135, 147, 178, 220–22, 225–28, 235, 265, 280
Amiun, alleged battle fought between Byzantine army and followers of John Marun, 140, 143, 145
Anastasius I, the Sinaite (593–698), 88
Anastasius, anti-Chalcedonian Emperor (d. 518), 39, 44, 50, 59

Anastasius, Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch (559–570), 34
Anawati, Rev. G. C., 217
Anbat (Nabatean), 177, 186–87, 189
Andrew, archbishop of Rhodes, delegate of Pope Eugene IV to the Eastern churches, 231
Anthimus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 39, 50, 52–53, 78, 80, 160
Antioche Païnne et Chrétienne, by Festugière, 19
Antonius de Troia, 230
Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (d. 390), 131, 263
Apostolic See of Rome, 170, 172, 228, 240–42, 256–57, 321
Aqiqi, Anton Dahir al-, 359
Aqqad, Salah al-, 359
Aquri, Bishop Arsanius al-, 197–98
Arida, Anton (d. 1955), Maronite patriarch, 288–89, 291–93
Arslan Majid, 298
Asad, Hafiz, president of Syria, 300
Ashrafiyya, headquarters of the Kata'ib (Phalangists), 299
Asi, al-, River. *See* Orontes
Asiaticus, delegate of Emperor Anastasius I to the East, 45
Assaf, Amir, 283
Assal, al-Safi Ibn al-, 251
Assemani, Joseph (1688–1768), 9, 13–14, 23, 26, 28, 63, 123, 125, 132, 134, 136, 147, 149, 152, 154, 162, 183–84, 193, 215–16, 270–71, 273
Assemani, Istefan Awwad (Evodius) (1711–82), 129
Assemani, Yusuf Louis (d. 1782), 152–53
Athanasius Gammala (d. 631), Syrian patriarch of Antioch, 91, 99
Atiya, Aziz, 307–309, 311, 328, 332
Atiyya, Najla, 359
Atsha, Musa Ibn, 126, 144, 153, 238
Awsar Raze (Storehouse of Secrets), by Bar Hebraeus, 129
Ayn Qura, 197–98
Ayn al-Rummana, 298
Baghdad Pact, 293
Baladhuri, Ahmad al- (d. 892), 177, 179, 186–90
Banhrani, Luqa al- (d. 1300?), presumably a Maronite patriarch, 221, 226–28
Bani, Murhij Nirun, al-. *See* Faustus Nairon
Baqufi, Nuh al-. *See* Nuh of Baqufa
Barbour, Yuhanna, 85
Baradaeus, Jacob (d. 578), 88, 123–26, 145
Bar Hebraeus (d. 1286), 5, 101, 103, 117, 129, 179
Bar Kifa, Moses (d. 903), bishop of Baremman, 155
Bar Salibi Dionysius (d. 1171), 73, 148–49, 151–53
Bardy, Gustave, 82
Barsauma, Syrian saint, 18, 65–67, 238
Basil, 82
Batriq, Sa'id Ibn, (d. 941), 8, 12, 32–35, 37, 119, 122, 218–19, 254
Batrun, al-, 132, 227, 280–81
Baybars, al-Zahir (1223–1277), Mamluk Sultan, 229
Bedjan, Paul Rev, 65
Begin, Menachem, Israeli Prime Minister, 299
Beggiani, Seely Joseph, Rev., 276
Benedict XIV, Pope, 83, 136–38, 168–69, 171, 265, 273–74
Bibliotheca Juris Orientalis Canonici et Civilis, by Joseph Assemani, 13, 133
Bibliotheca Orientalis by Joseph Assemani, 9, 26, 159, 215
Bishara, Jirjis, Maronite Priest, 133
Bkerki, 163, 288, 292, 301
Black September, 297
Brooks, E. W., 54, 124
Bruno, Father, 256, 262
Bustani, Amil, 297
Buturs Daww, Rev. *See* Daww

Cairo Agreement (1969), 297–98
Calixtus III, Pope, 235
Canard, M., 180

Caraffa, Cardinal, 242, 245–46, 248, 251, 266
Carlo Magno (Charlemagne) (742–814), believed by al-Duwayhi to be the uncle of John Marun. *See* Charlemagne
Catalogue of Abdisho, 129
Chabot, J. B. Rev., 157
Charanis, Peter, 59
Charlemagne, Emperor, 6, 120, 125
Cheikho, Louis, Rev. (d. 1927), 44, 83, 250–51, 253
Christotokos (Mother of Christ), 105, 158
Chosroes II, Persian King, 96
Chrysostom, Saint John, 16–17, 200
Clement VII, Pope, 171, 256
Clement XII, Pope, 270, 273
Clement Yusuf Dawud, bishop. *See* Dawud, Bishop Clement Yusuf
Codex Liturgicus, by Yusuf Louis Assemani, 152
Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, 168, 171, 212, 271
Conon, Pope (686–687), 130
Constants II, Emperor, 98
Constantine IV Pogonatus (668–685), emperor, 101, 111, 175, 180–81, 190, 193, 206, 213
Constitutional Block (al-Kutla al-Dusturiyya). *See* Dusturiyya
Cosmas, biographer of St. Simon the Stylite, 20
Cossartii, Gabriel, 47
Council of Constantinople (536), 8, 47–48, 55–56, 61
Council of Ehesus (431), 87, 91, 213–14
Council of Florence, 229, 233–34
Crawford, Robert C., 63, 218–19
Cyril of Alexandria, Saint, 33, 44, 68, 72, 76, 87, 91, 94, 96, 98, 102, 105–106, 112, 165–66, 200, 204
Cyril Tanas, Malkite Patriarch (d. 1760), 168, 171

Daʿbul, Fu'ad, 296
Damian, patriarch of Alexandria (570–605?), 84
Dandini, Jerome (1554–1634), 256–60, 262–64, 267, 276
Dara, Yuhanna (John) of (d. 860), 148, 154–155
David Bar Paul (750–840), Syrian poet and writer, 162
Dawud, Bishop Clement Yusuf (d. 1890), 9, 10, 63, 71, 111, 115, 123, 137, 149, 151, 156, 166, 172, 183–84, 186, 195, 202, 212
Dawud Pasha, 287
Dawud Shah (1576–1591), Syrian Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, 245
Daww, Butrus, Rev., 9, 19–20, 24–25, 28–29, 75, 77–78, 86, 92, 116, 280, 303
Dayr Murran, 27
Dayar al-Qamar, 281, 283
De Procuranda Salute Omnium Gentium, by Thomas à Jesu, 248, 252–53
De Recta Sententia, by Saint John of Damascus, 208–10
Deryan, Bishop Yusuf, 8, 106–107, 115–16, 163, 190, 198, 201–206
Dhimmitude, term used by Bashir Jumayyil, 303–304
Dib, George, 359
Dib, Pierre, bishop, 23, 267–68, 271, 273
Dibs, Bishop Yusuf al- (d. 1907), 9, 14, 18, 23, 35, 71, 84, 136–37, 151–52, 158, 160, 180, 188–90, 192, 195, 201–202, 205–206, 209, 214, 265
Dimashqi, al-. *See* Ibn Muhammad al-Katib
Dimlisawi, Irmia al- (1272–1297), Maronite patriarch, 221, 226
Dionysius Tal Mahri. *See* Tal Mahri
Dioscorus Isa Daww, bishop (1454–1477), 237–38
Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, 44, 65, 76, 122, 147
Dissertatio de origine nomine, by Faustus Nairon, 7
Djaradjima, by M. Canard, 180
Donus, Pope (676–678), 128
Druze, 279, 282–86, 290–91, 302
Downey, Glanville, 62
Duperron, Anquetil, 82

Dusturiyya, al-Kutla al-, 289
Duwayhi, Istefan al-, Maronite patriarch (d. 1704), 6, 8, 12–13, 17, 19, 24–25, 28, 44, 63, 70, 74, 93, 121–22, 124–25, 127–29, 131, 133, 136, 140–42, 144, 153, 170, 174, 193, 196–99, 201, 224, 231, 234, 237, 239–41, 245–46, 247, 252–55, 269–70, 283
Dvornik, Francis, 63

Ecchellensis, Abraham. *See* Abraham Ecchellensis (al-Haqillani)
Ecthesis issued by Emperor Heraclius (638), 98, 113, 126–27
Edde, Raymond, 297, 302
Eisenhower Doctrine, 293, 295
Eliano, Giovanni Battista, 245–52, 254–56, 262–63, 267
Elias, Maronite bishop, 231
Elipides, grandfather of John Marun according to al-Duwayhi, 120
Ephraim of Amida (527–545), Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, 51, 70–71, 124, 137, 254
Ephraim the Syrian Saint (d. 373), 77, 156–58
Epiphanius, Bishop of Tyre, 45
Epiphanius, Chalcedonian Patriarch of Antioch, 51
Evagrius, sixth-century historian, 5, 45–46, 61–62, 90
Eugene IV, Pope (1431–1447), 225, 229, 231, 233
Eusebius, disciple of the fifth-century Marun, 26
Eutyches, 44, 72, 122, 159, 263
Evoplia Fidei, by Faustus Nairon, 7

Fanqith, prayer book, 66
Faradis Monastery, 227, 262
Faustus, Nairon, 7, 183, 193, 201–202, 210
Festugière, A. J., 19–20
Ferrara, 229
Fida, abu al- (d. 1331), 28–29, 34
Fifth Council (553), convened by Emperor Justinian I, 71, 98
Fra Alexander, d'Ariosta, 235, 240
Fra Francis of Barcelona, 233
Fra Francis de Potenza, 240
Fra Gryphon (d. 1475), 228, 232–36, 239
Fra Juan, 229–30
Fra Marco de Florence, 240
Fra Peter de Ferrara, 230, 233
Fra Simon, 235
Fra Suriano, papal delegate to the Maronites, 235, 239–44
Franjieh, Sulayman, Lebanese president, 300
Frankel, Ephraim A., 359–60
Franzelin, Cardinal, explaining Monothelitism in a Catholic sense, 203
Frend, W. H. C., 46, 63, 82
Fuller, Peter, Patriarch of Antioch (471–488), 68–72, 209, 211, 263
Futuh al-Buldan, by al-Baladhuri, 186

Ganneau, Charles Clermont, 24
Gargumoye, Syriac form of Jarajima. *See* Jarajima
Ghaziri, Bernardus Ghubayra, Rev., 35, 86
Germanos Farhat (1670–1732), Maronite bishop, 44
Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (715–729), 208
Ghalamiyya, Nassar, 360
Ghurayyib, Michel, 290–91
Gibbon, Edward (1732–1794), 63
Greater Lebanon, 288
Gregorius, Monothelite patriarch of Antioch, 133
Gregory I, Pope (590–604), 57, 58
Gregory XIII, Pope, 225, 243–45, 248
Gregory of Nazinanzus, Saint (d. 389), 73

Hadathi, Butrus al-, Maronite patriarch (1458–1492), 235, 238, 239
Hadathi, Shimᶜun (Simon) al-, Maronite Patriarch, 138, 220, 239–40, 266
Hadathi, Yaᶜqub, al-, Maronite patriarch (d. 1458), 235
Hamadis Shiites, 282–83
Hamawi, Yaqut al-. *See* Yaqut
Haqq, Ibn Abd al- (d. 1308), 27
Harik, I., 358
Harnack, Adolf, 96, 204–205
Hefele, Charles Joseph, 48, 52, 72; defends Pope Honorius, 205
Henotikon (Instrument of Union), 49
Heraclius, Byzantine emperor (d. 641), 32–38, 93, 95–96, 99, 109, 112–13, 126, 130, 161, 174, 192, 204, 211, 265
High Maronite Council, 294
Hisham Ibn Abd al-Malik, Umayyad Caliph, 115
Hitti, Philip, 142
Hongimann, Ernest, 42, 45–46, 63
Honorius, Pope (d. 638), 8, 98, 103, 120, 123, 127, 131, 202–205; his condemnation for heresy, 206
Hormisda, Pope, 8–10, 29; letter of the monks to Hormisda, 40–43, 46–48, 51, 55, 58–60, 64, 69, 71, 73–76, 81, 83, 88, 217
Hourani, Albert, 358
Hubayqa, Eli, 300
Hubaysh, Yusuf (1823–1845), Maronite patriarch, 274, 285–86
Hubayshis, 282–83, 286
Huda, al- (Nomocanon). *See Kitab al-Huda*
Hurewitz, J. C., 359
Husayni, Taj al-Din al-, 289
Huwwar Mountain, 187
Huwayyik, Elias (d. 1931), Maronite patriarch, 287

Ibn Mahmud al-Katib al-Dimashqi, 27
Ihden, 226
Ihtijaj (apology) by al-Duwayhi, 253
Innocent I, Pope (402–417), 58
Innocent III, Pope (1198–1216), 123, 220–22, 224–25, 228, 254, 265–66, 267, 271
Innocent IV, Pope (1353–61), 225
Innocent IX, Pope, 269
Isaiah, bishop, 32, 99
Ismail, Adel, 359
Israel, 296–97, 299

Jabal Simᶜan, 24
Jacob of Edessa (d. 708), 89, 154, 156, 158
Jacob of Nisibin, Saint, 76
Jacob of Sarug (d. 521), 26, 67, 72, 113
Jacobites. *See* Syrian Orthodox
Jaji, Yuhanna al- (d. 1445), Maronite patriarch, 229, 231
Jarajima, 179, 180, 186–92, 303
Jarjuma, city in al-Lukam Mountain, 187–90
Jauda, Maryam Abu, 296
Jazzar, Ahmad pasha al-, 284
Jibbat, Bsharri, 226, 230, 280, 283
John VIII (1425–48), Byzantine emperor, 229
John II, Cappadocian patriarch of Constantinople, 50–51, 57
John of Damascus, Saint (d. 756), 101, 104, 165, 208–10, 212
John Marun, 7–8, 13–14, 36–37; writing attributed to, 93, 120–22; life and writing of, 118–67, 282
John Paul II, Pope, 302
John of Philadelphia, bishop, 127–28, 133–34
John of Serum, believed by al-Duwayhi to be John Marun, 120, 123–24, 133
Julian the Apostate, emperor (361–63), 21
Julian, bishop of Bostra, 63
Jullien, F. M., Rev., 30
Jumayyil, Amin, president of Lebanon, 299–300
Jumayyil, Bashir (d. 1982), 291, 299, 303–304
Jumayyil, Pierre (d. 1983), 294, 298, 302

Junblat, Kamal, 298
Justin I, Emperor, 39, 49, 59, 80, 137–38, 145
Justinian I, Emperor, 26, 28, 51, 53, 61, 76–77, 79–80, 83, 96–97, 100–101, 103, 138, 145
Justinian II, Rhinotmetus, Byzantine emperor (685–95), 14, 132, 140, 142–43, 181–82, 184–85, 192

Kaprakerameon (village of the vines). *See* Kfar Karmin
Karam, Yusuf, 286–87
Karmali, Anastase Marie al-, Rev. (d. 1947), 179, 185–86, 188, 193
Kaslik, 290, 291
Kaspar al-Gharib, 252
Kassis, Abbot Sharbal, 298
Kata'ib al- (Maronite phalangists), 289, 298–99
Kerr, David, 359
Kfar Karmin (Kaprakerameon), 42, 46
Kfarhayy, 139, 141, 146
Kfarnabu, 24
Khal, Yusuf al, 296
Khalidi, Ahmad Ibn Muhammad al-, 358
Khayl al-Rum (Byzantine cavalry), 190
Khazin, Abu Nawfal al-, 269, 282
Khazin, Yusuf Dirgham al- (d. 1742), Maronite patriarch, 271
Khomeini, Ayatullah, 279
Khreish, Antonius, Maronite Patriarch, 296, 298, 301–302
Khurshid pasha Ottoman Governor of Sidon, 286
Khuri, Bishara al- (d. 1964), Lebanese President, 289–90, 292–93
Khuri, Sa'd al-, 284
King Husayn of Jordan, 297
Kisrawan, 281, 282
Kitab al-Aghani, 192
Kitab al-Bayan 'an Tarikh Sinii Zaman al-'Alam 'ala Sabil al-Hujja wa al-Burhan by al-Munajjim, 28
Kitab al-Huda, 6–7, 118–19, 163, 196, 199, 201–202, 264
Kitab Jami' al-Hujaj al-Rahina fi Ibtal Da'awa al-Mawarina, by Bishop Clement Yusuf Dawud, 9, 183
Kitab al-Kamil fi al-Tarikh by Ibn al-Athir, 188
Kitab al-Tanbih wa al-Ishraf, by al-Mas'udi, 6, 29, 36

Labbe, Philip, 47, 54
Labourt, M'Abbe, 154
Lam'is, 283
Lammens, Henri, Rev. (d. 1937), 23, 26, 29–30, 44, 78, 175–77, 179, 182–83, 185, 188, 227, 234, 236
Lateran Council (649), convened by Pope Martin I, in its fifth canon endorsed as Orthodox the doctrine of one nature (monophysitism) considered as a heresy by the Church of Rome, 68
Lateran Council (1215), 221
Latinization of the Maronite Church, 267, 278
Laysa al-Marada al-Jarajima by Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, 188
Lebanan al-Ta'ifi, by Anis Sayigh, 292
Lebanese Council (1736), 136, 147, 266, 270–74
Lebanese massacre of 1860, 286
Lent, Frederick, Rev., 65
Leo I, Emperor, 65
Leo I, Pope, 33, 57, 59, 166
Leo II, Pope, 206
Leo X, Pope, 240, 241
Leontius of Byzantium, 164
Lequien, Michel, 209–10, 212
Lercari, Nicolaus, R. P., 171
Libellus (confession of faith) of Pope Hormisda, 59
Limitanei, 182
Louis XIV, King of France, 268
Lubab al-Barahin al-Jaliyya, by Bishop Yusuf Deryan, 8
Lucini, Louis Maria, Cardinal, 167
Ludolf de Suchem, 227–28
Lukam, Jabal al- (Ukomo or the Amanus), 175, 189–91
Lulun, al-, 180, 186–87

Maʿni, Fakhr al-Din II (1590–1635), 1–2, 281–82
Maʿarra or Maʿarrat al-Nuʿman, 27
Macarius, Monothelite patriarch of Antioch (656–681), 120–21, 131, 133, 231
Macedonius, Monothelite Patriarch of Antioch, 133
Madihat Kisrawan (the Zajaliyya of al-Qilaʿi), 7, 226
Mahdi, al-, Abbasid Caliph (775–785), 117
Makhluf, Butrus, Maronite bishop of Cyprus, 152
Makhluf, Yuhanna (d. 1633), Maronite Patriarch, 281
Malcart Agreement (1973), 297
Malkites, 22, 88–89, 102–104, 112–16, 119, 126, 132, 134, 139, 146, 161, 167, 169, 192, 197, 224, 233, 240
Mansi, Giovanni, D., 83
Mansur, Amir, 283
Marasid al-Ittilaʿ fi Asma al-Amkina wa al-Biqaʿ by Ibn Abd al-Haqq, 27
Marada. *See* Mardaites
Marcian, Byzantine emperor, 28–29, 34, 88
Marcianus, disciple of the fifth-century Marun, 30
Marcus of Lisbon, bishop, 234
Mardaites, 1, 9, 12–14, 129, 133–34, 143, 175, 177–78, 180–87, 189–92, 209, 303
Maridoye, Syriac form of Mardaites (Marada). *See* Mardaites
Mark, bishop of Porto, 234
Maronia, thought by Assemani as a Persian tribe, 215
Maronite Church, 1–2, 6–7, 66, 135, 283, 287
Maronite League (al-Rabita al-Maruniyya), 291
Maronite Nation, 9, 20, 129, 173, 280
Maronite School in Rome 1584, 7, 268
Marqolon, disciple and biographer of Saint Simon the Stylite, 65
Martin I, Pope (d. 655), 68, 98
Martinus, Jesuit priest, 30
Marun of Ayn Zarba, 26
Marun, the fifth-century ascetic, 13, 16–18, 171–72
Marun al-Tubani (Blessed Marun) by al-Qilaʿi, 6, 239
Marwan II (744–750), Umayyad Caliph nicknamed al-Himar (the Ass), 114
Maurice and Maurician, 139–40, 142
Maslama Ibn Abd al-Malik, 187
Maurice, Byzantine emperor (582–602), 12, 35
Masʿad, Bulus (Paul) (d. 1890), Maronite patriarch, 222, 265, 274, 286
Masʿudi, Abu al-Hasan al- (d. 956), 5, 27, 31–32, 119, 178
Maʿushi, Bulus al- (d. 1975), Maronite patriarch, 2, 274, 293, 295
Matn, 281
Maymun al-Rumi, nicknamed Jurjumani, 188
Maximus, Abbot, 98, 101–106, 110–12, 114, 160
Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople, 46, 52, 76, 79–80, 97
Michael the Great (the Syrian), Patriarch of Antioch, 5, 65, 91
Mifuq Monastery, 230
Milhim, Amir (d. 1568), 282–83
Mnurath Qudshe (Lamp of the Sanctuaries), by Bar Hebraeus, 101
Monastery of Dorotheus, 75
Monastery of Louisa, 198, 270
Monastery of Mar Basus, 89
Monastery of Mar Yaʿqub, 238
Monastery of Marun, 8, 10, 12, 22, 25–26, 28–29, 31–32, 34, and throughout
Monastery of Marun at Armanaz, 84–86, 90
Monastery of Marun near Constantinople, 26, 74
Monastery of Marun near Damascus, 26, 74
Monastery of Nbuh, 227
Monastery of Our Lady at Yanuh, 136, 226
Monastery of Qanubin, 230, 236, 241, 246–47, 249

Monophysitism and Monophysites, 21–22, 28, 67–68, 88, 97, 109. *See also* Syrian Orthodox
Monothelitism, 5–8, 35, 38, 89, 90–91, 97, 101, 103, 105, 109, 113, 122, 126, 135, 143, 146, 160, 163–64, 166, 174, 179; promoted by Heracleus, 184, 192, 194–216; passim, 231–32, 259, 261
Mosheim, John Von, 97
Mount Olympus, 24
Muᶜallaq, al-, Monastery of, 89
Muᶜawiya, Umayyad Caliph, 158, 170, 177–78, 180, 188
Mubarak, Maronite bishop, 292
Muhamed Ali, Viceroy of Egypt, 285
Muᶜjam al-Buldan by Yaqut al-Hamawi, 27, 188
Muhasib, Elias, bishop of Arqa, 273
Munajjim, Abu Isa Ahmad Ibn Ali al-, 28
Muquddam Abd al-Munᶜim Ayyub of Bsharri, 237–238
Muquddam Rizq Allah, 237, 242
Muqaddam Yaᶜqub of Bsharri, 230
Murad, Niqula (d. 1862), Maronite bishop, 284
Musᶜab Ibn al-Zubayr, 186
Mustafa Nuri Pasha, Ottoman General, 285
Muzhir, Yusuf, 14

Nabu (Yanbu), 24
Najjar, Munir, 296
Nahar, al-, Beirut daily, 296
Nairon, Faustus; Murhij Nirun al-Bani (d. 1711). *See* Faustus Nairon
Nasir, Abd al-, Egyptian President (d. 1970), 293–95, 297
National Pact (al-Mithaq al-Watani) (1943), 288, 290–91, 296–97, 301–302
Nau, Francois, Rev., 84–85, 88, 156–58, 164, 215–16
Nawwar, Abd al-Aziz, 358–59
Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, 17, 33, 76, 106, 159, 213–14, 276
Nöldeke, Theodor, 20–21, 178–79, 183
Nuᶜman, Abbot Bulus, 303
Nuh of Baqufa, Syrian Orthodox patriarch, 228, 238

On Priesthood, ascribed to John Marun, 154
One Incarnate Nature of the Divine Logos, 52, 67–68, 72, 87, 91, 96, 99, 100, 104, 108, 113, 145, 158, 164, 166, 179, 126, 160, 205, 227, 236, 238, 246–47, 254–55, 263–65
Origen, 82
Orontes river, 13, 23, 27–29, 36, 83, 111, 119, 139

Pagum figulorum (Potter's village), 75
Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), 297
Pascal II, Pope, 220
Paul the Black, patriarch of Alexandria, deposed in 581, 84
Paul the "Jew," patriarch of Antioch, 138
Paul of Samosata, patriarch of Antioch (260–72), 204
Pelagius II, Pope, 57
Peres, Shimon, 299
Peter, bishop of Apamea, 39–41, 45, 48, 50, 55, 60–61, 75–76, 80, 82–83, 211
Peter III of Callinicus (581–591), Patriarch of Antioch, 84
Peter, bishop of Damascus, 45, 62
Peter of Saint Marcellus, Cardinal, 221, 223–25, 265–66
Philippicus, Emperor (711–713), 98–99
Philoxenus of Mabug, 26
Pius V, Pope (1566–72), 242
Pius VII, Pope, 169
Pius IX, Pope, 274
Pius XII, Pope, 272, 276, 294
Polk, William, 358
Prentice, W. K., 82
Probus, 85
Progressive Socialist Party, 298

Qalʿat Simʿan, 24
Qadisha Valley, 227, 230
Qanubin, First Council of (1580), 250–51, 253, 258, 262, 267
Qanubin, Second Council of (1596), 258–60, 262–63, 268, 276, 280
Qara'ali Bulus, 226, 229
Qartmin, Monastery of, 116
Qilaʿi, Jabra'il Ibn al-, bishop of Nicosia (d. 1516), 6–7, 11, 13, 93, 113, 119–20, 123, 127, 131, 133, 139, 146–47, 162–63, 169, 172, 192–93, 199, 201, 218, 221, 226–29, 237, 239
Qinnesrin, Monastery of, 89
Qnumo, Syriac term meaning person, 104
Quaresmio, Francisco P., Latin writer, 132
Qurush (Cyrus) district in Syria Prima, believed to be the place where the ascetic Marun lived, 24

Rabula, bishop of Edessa, 70
Raggio, Thomas, 254
Rajji, Mikhaʿil al-, Rev., 150, 155
Randal, Jonathan, 360
Rastan, al- (Arehusa), town in Syria, 23, 24
Religiosa Historia, by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, 7
Renaudot, Eusèbe (1646–1720), pioneer French Orientalist, 148–49, 151, 153, 172
Ruh al-Rudud fi Tafnid Zaʿm al-Khuri Dawud, by Bishop Yusuf al-Dibs, 9, 195, 201
Rustam, Asad, 115, 133
Ruzzi, Mikha'il al- (d. 1581), Maronite patriarch, 220, 241–43, 251, 257, 262
Ruzzi, Sarkis al- (1581–1596), Maronite patriarch, 246–47, 249, 257, 262
Ruzzi, Yusuf al- (d. 1608), Maronite patriarch, 268

Sabʿali, Joseph, 359
Sabra and Shatila, Palestinian refugee camps, 299
Saʿd, Elias, 273
Sacrosancta Concilia, 47–48, 127
Safar, Athanasius, 149
Safrawi, Yuhanna al- (d. 1656), Maronite patriarch, 268
Sahil al-, Conference (1933), 288
Saint John Chrysostom. *See* Chrysostom
Salam, Sa'ib, Lebanese Prime Minister, 293
Salibi, Kamal, 107
Salim, Jihad, 360
Salim, Muhammad Abd al-Ru'uf, 359
Samar Jubayl, 140, 144, 146
San Severino, Cardinal, 248
Sarkis, bishop. *See* Ruzzi, Sarkis al-, Maronite patriarch
Sayigh, Anis, 292
Sayqali, Niqula, 296
Sayyad, al-, magazine, 296
Second Council of Ephesus (449), 65
Second Vatican Council (1963–1965), 277
Senun, Monastery of, 89
Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610–638), 96, 121, 137, 203–204
Sergius, Pope (687–701), 8, 127
Sergius of Rishayna, 52
Severinus Binius, 47
Severus Ibn al-Muqaffaʿ, Coptic bishop of the Ashmunin, 35
Severus Isa, bishop of Hardin (1443–1480), 237
Severus Muhanna (1571–1590), Syrian Orthodox bishop of Hardin, 251
Severus, Patriarch of Antioch (d. 538), 10, 26, 39–41, 44–52, 54, 56, 60–63, 66–67, 75, 78, 80–83, 106, 110–11, 137–38, 140, 144, 147, 211
Shababi, Mikha'il, Rev., 34
Shalaq, Fadl, 359
Shamoun, Camille, Lebanese President, 292–95, 302
Sharar, Liturgy of Addai and Mari, 276
Sharfa Monastery, 155
Sharon, Ariel, 299
Shartuni, Rashid al-Khuri al-, 6, 63

Shayzar (Larissa), a town in Syria (present-day Shayjar), 27, 37
Shidrawi, Ishaq al-, Archbishop, 268
Shihabi, Amir Ali, first of the Shihabi princes to convert to Christianity, 269
Shihabi, Amir Bashir II (d. 1850), 283–85
Shihabi, Amir Bashir III, Abu Tahin (d. 1860), 285
Shihabi, Amir Haydar, 283
Shihabi, Amir Yusuf, 284
Shihab, Fu'ad, 295
Shuf, al-, 281
Shukri, Arsanius, Maronite bishop, 168
Sihyuni, Jabra'il al-, Gabriel Sionita (d. 1648), 7, 12, 150
Simon the Stylite, Saint (d. 459), 9, 19–21, 24, 29–30, 45, 60, 64, 66, 68
Sixth Council (680): 112–13, 126, 131–32, 164–65, 168; condemned Pope Honorius, 206, 208, 213, 218
Sixtus IV, Pope, 240
Sliba Zkha (d. 728), Nestorian Patriarch, 212–13, 216
Soffred, Cardinal, 266
Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, 98, 203
Stephen Niobes, 84
St. Sophia Church in Cyprus, 231
Suda, Yusuf al-, 289
Sulayman the Magnificent (1520–60), Ottoman Sultan, 281
Sulh, Rashid al-, 298
Sulh, Riyad al-, 290
Shuhada al-Majmaᶜ al-Khalqayduni fi al-Tarikh, by Rev. Louis Cheikho, 44
Sunnites, 282, 288, 290, 302
Synod of 518 to which the monks of Syria Secunda addressed a letter, 40, 46–50, 56
Syrian Orthodox Church and Community, 1, 70–71, 92, 94, 97, 100, 102, 105, 113, 119–20, 126, 132, 135, 139, 146, 148, 150, 157, 159, 161, 164, 166, 175–79, 196, 208, 211, 224, 226–27, 235, 237, 240, 244, 246–47, 250, 254–55, 263–64, 272, 274, 276, 303
Tagmata, 181
Taj al-Arus (Arabic Lexicon), 188
Talᶜada, Monastery of, 89
Tal Mahri, Dionysius (d. 845), Syrian Patriarch of Antioch, 5, 8, 32, 34–36, 67–68, 84, 89, 91–92, 95, 98, 100–101, 103–104, 108–109, 114–116, 118, 135, 174, 182, 189–90, 191, 208
Tal al-Zaᶜtar, 297–98
Tarbin, Ahmad, 359
Tarikh al-Azmina, by al-Duwayhi, 239
Tarikh al-Ta'ifa al-Maruniyya by al-Duwayhi, 6, 9, 12, 239
Tarrazi, Viscount Philip, 227
Tchalenko, G., 86
Ten Treatises of Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, 6, 110–11, 198
The Book of the Offering of the Eucharist According to the Maronite Tradition, contains collections of liturgies published in Rome in 1594, 150
The Doctrine of the Jacobites, 121, 126, 128, 132, 140, 146, 153
The Exposition of the Eucharistic Service, 151, 154
The Exposition of the Faith, attributed to John Marun, 92, 118–19, 132, 148, 150, 155, 160–61, 163–66, 254
The Imitation of Christ, by Thomas à Kempis, 248
The Maronite Rite: A Catechism, 276
The Three Chapters, 97–98
Theodora, Empress, 51–52, 79
Theodore of Harran (d. 820), 103, 165, 205–206
Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429), 17, 105, 199–200, 214
Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus (d. 458), 5, 17–19, 23, 25–26, 28, 31, 93, 214
Theodosius, Patriarch of Alexandria, 52–53
Theopaschites, 72, 106
Theophanes, Byzantine historian (d. 818), 5, 97, 129, 141, 179–81, 183, 189–91
Theophanes, Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch (d. 687), 8, 129, 137

Theophilact Ibn Qanbara, Malkite patriarch, 89, 114–16
Theophile Ibn Tuma al-Ruhawi, Maronite astrologer of Abbasid Caliph al-Mahdi, 117, 179
Theotokos (Mother of God), 105, 158, 213
Thomas à Jesu, 248, 252, 254–55
Thomas à Kempis, 248
Thou who wast crucified for us have mercy on us, 69–72, 89–90, 101, 122, 209–11, 213–14, 228, 243, 263–64
Timothy (d. 823), Nestorian patriarch, 204, 212, 214–16
Tome of Leo, 33, 39, 54, 71, 80, 99, 102, 106, 108
Torrey, Charles C., 64–65
Touma, Toufiq, 358
Tripoli, 229–30, 235, 246, 281, 288
Trisagion, 10, 69–70, 73, 209–10, 213, 228, 243
Trullan (Quinisext) Council (692), 143, 210
Tuma, bishop of Kfartab, 6, 11, 110–13, 122, 159, 162–64, 197, 199, 202–203, 262
Typus issued by Emperor Constans II (648), 98, 126–27

Ujaymi, Yuhamma, Malkite priest, 130
Umar Ibn Abd al-Aziz, Umayyad Caliph, 27
Uniate Churches (Roman Catholic), 1, 9, 167–68
United Arab Republic (U.A.R.), 294–95, 297
Urban VIII, Pope, allegedly established the Sainthood of John Marun, 171
Urnut. *See* Orontes River

Vailhé, Siméon, 88–89
Vasiliev, A. A., 60
Vigilius, Pope, 97–98, 103

Walid Ibn Abd al-Malik (705–715), Umayyad Caliph, 115, 187
Waqidi, al- (d. 822), 188
William, Cardinal, 221
William of Tyre, 8, 171, 217–19
Wright, William, 84

Yaqut al-Hamawi (d. 1229), 27, 188
Yeshue of Basibrina, 67
Yuhanna Nazuk Nestorian Catholicos, 199
Yusuf Istefan, Maronite patriarch, 169–70

Zachariah of Mitylene, 51–52, 70
Zahla, 281
Zajaliyya (ode), by al-Qila'i, 7, 146, 226–27, 237, 239
Zayek, Francis, Maronite bishop, 277
Zeno, Emperor (d. 491), 49
Z'ura, sixth-century Syrian ascetic, 39, 50–51, 53–55, 61, 76–77, 79

FOR MORE GORGIAS PRESS REPRINTS,
SEE WWW.GORGIASPRESS.COM.